

SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 10, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee in the face of a great task, that we may be workmen that need not be ashamed. We are not satisfied that our Government shall be only the expression of our best philosophy of human life, but we would remember that back of all our endeavor and back of all our authority is God's will. Thy will can not be changed by human force, but it is ever responsive to human needs. We pray that Thou wilt supply us with all the graces of character and that wisdom which will fit us for the tasks of this day, and that that which we do may redound to the honor and glory of Thy name. For Christ's sake. Amen.

WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, a Senator from the State of Michigan; JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi; and LEBARON B. COLT, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

TREATMENT OF TUBERCULOSIS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 26, 1913, a report by the United States Public Health Service relative to the methods and practice employed by Drs. Karl and Sylvia von Ruck in treating tuberculosis and rendering persons immune from tuberculosis, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

ENDOWMENT OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES (H. DOC. NO. 1334).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the disbursements for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1915, made in the States and Territories under the provisions of the act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

MOUNT WEATHER, VA. (H. DOC. NO. 1330).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report as to the present condition and value of Mount Weather, Va., a weather station established in the Blue Ridge Mountains, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

MARITIME CANAL CO. (H. DOC. NO. 1327).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a further report of the Maritime Canal Co. of Nicaragua, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (H. DOC. NO. 1330).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States for the year 1914, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 1389).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

TRAVEL OF EMPLOYEES IN CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY (H. DOC. NO. 1277).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail the number of officers or employees of the Library of Congress who have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1914, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LIBRARY BUILDING AND GROUNDS (H. DOC. NO. 1276).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk in charge of the Library Building and Grounds, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement in regard to the purchase of typewriting machines during the first three months of the fiscal year 1915, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6867. An act to increase and fix the compensation of the collector of customs for the customs collection district of Omaha;

H. R. 12303. An act to amend section 3246 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 15038. An act proposing an amendment to the Federal reserve act relative to acceptances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15902. An act to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications; and

H. R. 17869. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of the State of Georgia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WORKS presented petitions of sundry members of church and Sunday school organizations in the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors within the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lake Crystal, Minn., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Presbytery of Winona, Minn., praying for national prohibition and remonstrating against any effort on the part of Congress to nullify the Indian treaty of 1855, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THORNTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Jackson, La., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston, New Bedford, Fall River, Lowell, Worcester, Pittsfield, Holyoke, Winchester, Dedham, Revere, Springfield, and Chelsea, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Thompsonville; of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of North Star; of the Menominee Range Ministerial Association, of Iron Mountain; and of sundry citizens of Ashley, Ithaca, and Pompeii, all in the State of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I present a memorial in the form of a resolution and ask to have it read at the desk by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the memorial.

The memorial was read and referred to the Committee on the Philippines, as follows:

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,
40 Central Street, Boston.

Resolved, That the Anti-Imperial League earnestly urges the immediate passage by the Senate of the bill reforming the Government of the Philippine Islands which passed the House at the last session as an important step toward the fulfillment of the promise repeatedly made by the Democratic Party to give the Philippine Islands their independence.

MOORFIELD STOREY, President.
ERVING WINSLLOW, Secretary.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. OVERMAN. On January 19, 1914, I introduced a joint resolution, being Senate joint resolution 99, requesting the President to consider the expediency of effecting a treaty with European powers providing for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and to protect an independent government there when established, and it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the

joint resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 6857) authorizing the retirement from active service, with increased rank, of officers now on the active list of the Army who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 6858) to amend the postal laws of the United States; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 6859) granting certain lands to school district No. 56, Klickitat County, Wash., and authorizing the issuance of patent therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 6860) granting an increase of pension to Edward Pilot (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 6861) for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 6863) concerning water-power plants hereafter located upon the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 6864) granting a pension to Minnie Lord Henderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 6865) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, and to prohibit the treating or giving of intoxicating liquors to minors in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 6866) for the relief of Vilhelm Torkildsen;

A bill (S. 6867) granting an increase of pension to James K. Deyo (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6868) granting an increase of pension to F. A. Heebner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 6869) granting an increase of pension to Sanford A. Herendeen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6870) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Manning (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6871) granting an increase of pension to John B. Way (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 6872) granting a pension to Guss Gurtz;

A bill (S. 6873) granting an increase of pension to Anna Mott;

A bill (S. 6874) granting an increase of pension to Juriah Cline;

A bill (S. 6875) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shapley; and

A bill (S. 6876) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. McCorkle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 6877) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 6878) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Girdler;

A bill (S. 6879) granting an increase of pension to Annette M. Lamoreaux; and

A bill (S. 6880) granting an increase of pension to Esen Z. Guild; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 6881) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Kimball; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 210) to authorize the President to invite certain Governments to send delegates to the Pan American Medical Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENYON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) requesting the nations now at war to declare a truce for 20 days; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WAR SUPPLIES.

Mr. WORKS. I introduce a short bill which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the bill.

The bill (S. 6862) to forbid the furnishing of war materials to belligerent nations was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person, corporation, or association, a citizen or resident of, or doing business in the United States, to contract for, sell, supply, or furnish to any nation engaged in war, or its armies or soldiers, any food, clothing, supplies, arms, ammunition, horses, or war supplies of any kind, whether the same be contraband of war or not.

Sec. 2. Any person, corporation, or association violating the provisions of this act shall be fined not less than \$5,000 nor more than \$100,000 for each offense.

Sec. 3. Each contract, sale, or furnishing of any such supplies shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Sec. 4. Any officer, agent, or representative of any corporation or association participating in any act of contracting for or furnishing any such supplies, or knowing thereof and consenting thereto, shall be liable under this act.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPORT OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent that the report from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, which was laid before the Senate on the 7th instant, being a full and complete account of all property in his possession and in the Senate Office Building belonging to the United States, be taken from the table and that it be printed as a document [S. Doc. No. 638]. It is the annual report of the Sergeant at Arms required by law, and it is printed each year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that the statement of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate relative to the proceeds derived from the sale of certain property belonging to the United States be taken from the table and that it be printed as a document [S. Doc. No. 639]. This is the annual statement of the Sergeant at Arms, which is required by law and which is printed each year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 497), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to employ an additional stenographer, at the rate of \$100 per month, the term of service of such stenographer to conclude with the final adjournment of the third session, Sixty-third Congress.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 6867. An act to increase and fix the compensation of the collector of customs for the customs collection district of Omaha was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 12303. An act to amend section 3246 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 15038. An act proposing an amendment to the Federal reserve act relative to acceptances, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 15902. An act to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 17869. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of the State of Georgia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6060, the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6060. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, lines 14, 15, and 16, strike out the following words:

On account of aliens who have, in accordance with law, declared their intention of becoming citizens of the United States or.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. It will be agreed to, without objection.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 4, line 15, after the word "alien," to strike out the additional proviso in the following words:

Provided further, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to aliens arriving in Guam or Hawaii; but if any such alien, not having become a citizen of the United States, shall later arrive at any port or place of the United States on the North American Continent, the provisions of this section shall apply.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, from the very hasty examination I have been able to give this bill, which appears to be rushing forward with an unprecedented speed, I am not sure that I fully comprehend the effect of this amendment. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if it is the purpose of the amendment to permit the landing of all kinds of aliens without restriction in the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The object is just the opposite. It is proposed that the proviso be stricken out. Those in charge of the administration of the law recommended it to the committee, and it was agreed to. The Secretary of Labor said:

The exemption, of course, has never amounted to anything so far as Guam is concerned, and its value as an encouragement to European immigration to Hawaii—which is understood to have been the original purpose of its insertion in the law—may seriously be doubted. Its chief effect is to relieve a number of Asiatic aliens of the payment of \$4 each time they enter or reenter the islands. Moreover, the Government is paying all the expense of the enforcement of the law in Hawaii, and there seems to be no sound reason why aliens entering that territory should not contribute to the "revenues" collected from immigrants.

Mr. REED. That explanation is satisfactory to me, and my only apology for asking the question is that it has been impossible for me to give the bill full consideration. I had hoped that the Senator in charge of it would be willing to let it lie over one day further, but he appears to be unwilling to do so. I examined the bill as well as I could last night, and I shall ask for no further time myself.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to state to the Senator from Missouri that after having perfected the bill by these committee amendments I hope all the time necessary for a full understanding and discussion of the bill will be had in this body, because it is a bill of prime importance, and I do not propose to deny to any Member of the Senate an opportunity to understand it fully. As I said yesterday, the amendments are largely verbal and do not touch the vital issues in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Immigration was, in section 3, page 4, line 25, after the word "previously," to insert "persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority; persons with chronic alcoholism," so as to read:

SEC. 3. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons; persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority; persons with chronic alcoholism—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will venture to ask the chairman of the committee who is responsible for the phrase "constitutional psychopathic inferiority" and just what it means?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. All I can say is that that phrase came from that very learned, necessary, and dignified body of which the honorable Senator from New Hampshire is a member. It came, as I understand, from the American Society of Medicine.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a psychopath is a morally irresponsible person; that is the definition that I have become acquainted with; but how we are going to determine whether an alien has a "constitutional psychopathic inferiority" that should exclude him I can not quite comprehend. What degree of inferiority will be required as sufficient to exclude him? If the phrase were "psychopathic constitutional tendency," or "constitutional psychopathic infirmity," I could understand that, but the word "inferiority" is certainly an obscure one.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I presume that phraseology was incorporated by the learned body of medical doctors of this country. They incorporated it, as they do a great many other things; they cover up some very innocent and some very harmful things sometimes under a phraseology. I suppose the phrase

means one whose moral inheritance renders him by virtue of his hereditary taint inferior. I do not know of any other meaning of the phrase. We incorporated the phrase believing, as I think the Senator believes, in the wisdom of that learned profession.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course a person is mentally inferior if he belongs to that class; but when you speak of "constitutional psychopathic inferiority," you must have something to compare it with, and I do not know what it is. If the comparison is to be made with an entirely sound mind, I think that the degree of inferiority should in some way be defined.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], is fresher in the matter of medicine than I am, and I should like to ask him if he can interpret the phrase "psychopathic constitutional inferiority"?

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will say that I was much puzzled by that phrase in the bill when I read it. I do not know how "constitutional psychopathic inferiority" can be ascertained or who is to sit in judgment upon another man in relation to that matter; but we might get a psychopathic judge.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, as we have provided for medical examinations, and as this recommendation came from an organized medical body of this country, the committee concluded that medical men would be the best interpreters of it, and were the very best people to conserve the interests of the United States in this regard.

Mr. GALLINGER. This bill will go to conference, and doubtless the suggestion I have made will lead to an inquiry concerning the matter. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina what medical association or what medical gentlemen suggested that phraseology?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have not the letter pertaining to the matter before me at this moment, but I can produce it. The suggestion came from the leading physicians in the city of New York, I believe, and possibly from those of some other contiguous cities.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am myself so rusty in medicine that I do not pretend to understand a great many modern medical terms, but this struck me as being so peculiar that I thought I would call attention to it. However, if distinguished alienists suggested it I certainly will not contest it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suppose the phrase is intended to mean a broader condition of inferiority than mere tendencies.

Mr. GALLINGER. Likely so, but the degree of inferiority is an important matter. Some distinguished philosopher has suggested that we are all insane, it being only a matter of degree, and there is much force in that suggestion.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from New Hampshire takes his seat—he is not only a learned physician, but he is also a scholar—I should like also to have his opinion on the phrase "persons with chronic alcoholism." The language is not "persons afflicted with chronic alcoholism," but simply "persons with chronic alcoholism." Is there some medical refinement that might make that term plain?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I think the language would be greatly improved if the words "afflicted with" were inserted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the chairman of the committee does not understand the phrase, that the learned Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] does not understand it, and that the learned physician, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], does not know what it means, it seems to me it would be quite in order for the Senate to accept it for the same reason that the committee has accepted it, and to pass it along, turning these people over to the tender mercies of the immigration agent who is presumptively much more intelligent than any of the gentlemen I have just named.

Speaking seriously, however, it occurs to me that the phrase ought to go back to the committee to be revamped and clarified. So I suggest that the amendment be passed over, in order that the committee may again go over it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is useless to take up the time of the Senate on a matter of this kind. As I said before, this language was recommended by the physicians who have in charge the examination of these immigrants; certain of their terminology is not familiar to us; but it was incorporated in the bill, and as they are the ones charged with the duty of examining these immigrants to ascertain their physical defects and ailments the language was incorporated as recommended.

I myself think that the suggestion made that the phrase "persons with chronic alcoholism" might be improved by inserting the words "afflicted with" or "possessed of." I

think that, however, can be very easily worked out in conference.

Mr. REED. I can hardly agree to the phrase suggested by the Senator from South Carolina—"persons possessed of chronic alcoholism." I think the amendment ought to go back to the committee, and I ask the chairman of the committee to consent to the amendment being passed over. Otherwise, I shall make a motion that it be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Very well; let the amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment of the Committee on Immigration was, in section 3, page 5, line 8, after the word "such," to strike out the words "mental or," so as to read:

Persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, after the word "or," to strike out the words "admit having committed" and to insert "who at the time of seeking admission to the United States are legally charged with," so as to read:

Persons who have been convicted of or who at the time of seeking admission to the United States are legally charged with a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it seems to me that this raises a very interesting and important question. The language of the House bill was:

Persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude.

That is changed by the committee of the Senate to read:

Persons who have been convicted of or who at the time of seeking admission to the United States are legally charged with a felony.

If that phrase is so drawn that it will relate only to those acts which we ordinarily denominate crimes, which are recognized as crimes in this country, then I think I would offer no objection to it, but at several places in the bill a somewhat similar change appears, and it seems to me that it might result in this, that persons charged with political crimes and seeking refuge in this country might be denied admission and turned back to the country from which they had escaped.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will allow me, if he will look on page 9, line 21, at the bottom of the page, he will find that the text of the bill reads as follows:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of or legally charged with an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude.

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, I still am fearful of the effect of the phraseology as to a crime purely political.

This occurs to me—and I think it is a serious matter—it has been our policy always to permit one who seeks refuge in this country, who flees from the tyranny of other lands, to enter here; and it is my understanding, although I have not had the opportunity to examine it, that such a person has hitherto been accorded the right of a trial in our courts to determine whether or not he was merely a political fugitive. Of course, such fugitives are always charged with high treason, or they are charged with some other crime which, so far as the charge is concerned, involves a great degree of moral turpitude; but, as a matter of fact, while that may be the charge, yet these people may be fleeing from oppression. The mere charge ought not to bar them from entry.

Let me illustrate that to the Senate; and I use this illustration merely to elucidate the argument. Germany has overrun and for the time being has conquered and taken possession of Belgium. Suppose, now, that a Belgian were to assail the authorities who have been established there through the force of arms; that this Belgian, believing that his loyalty and duty were still to the King of his country, who has been expelled, were to do some act which offended against the present military power; suppose that he should be legally charged with some act, the charge involving moral turpitude, whereas as a matter of fact all he had done was to contend on behalf of his stricken land, and under those circumstances he were to come to this country, seeking harbor and refuge, would it be the part of wisdom or would it be consistent with our national policies as they have heretofore existed, upon the mere presentation of a charge or indictment, to compel an immigration agent to turn him back? I do not think we should do that, and yet I believe that would be the consequence of this language.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. LODGE. I was merely going to say to the Senator that this clause, except for the words in italics, is the existing law. Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Under the act of 1907.

Mr. LODGE. The only difference is the insertion by the Senate committee of the words "legally charged."

Mr. REED. That is exactly the point I am making.

Mr. LODGE. One moment. The Senator is speaking about the Belgians. Of course Belgium is now under military control. We recognize the Belgian Government's existence; the Belgian minister is here received. We take no recognition of that military control. There could be no indictment, because that territory is under military power, and I can not conceive how this provision could be so twisted as to keep out a Belgian because he fought for his country.

Mr. REED. Now, if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. LODGE. Of course we do not want to do anything of that sort. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. REED. I do not believe the Senator does want to do that.

Mr. LODGE. But I do not see how the provision can possibly be twisted in such a way as to do that.

Mr. REED. The Senator is arguing the details of an illustration, which is never the right way to arrive at a conclusion, which the illustration was simply offered to elucidate. While it is true that Belgium is to-day under military control, it does not follow that next week or next month the Imperial Government of Germany may not set up a civil government in Belgium, establish courts and forms of procedure there; neither does it follow that if a poor Belgian under those circumstances should refuse to obey some order he might not be indicted under some law or rule established by the autocratic authority which might be set up; and to say to him that, because the charge has been made, he can not come into this country, it seems to me, is going too far. He can not even be permitted to show that the charge is untrue; he can not be permitted to go back of a mere indictment or charge by some officer; but he must be bound absolutely by it, being denied the right to show the fact to be that his act was purely that of a patriot seeking to defend his country.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, we should have to recognize the German Government there first. No weight would be given to their proceedings unless we had recognized that they were the Government there.

Mr. REED. Possibly that is the case, and yet I do not think it necessarily follows. I do not believe that a mere charge ought to be sufficient to keep a man out. I believe we ought to reserve to ourselves the right to ascertain the facts for ourselves. I should not object at all to a clause imposing upon the applicant for admission the burden of showing that the charge was unfounded; but to deny him absolutely the right to enter this country would, in my opinion, if the same policy had existed in the past, have excluded the great majority of those patriotic people who fled here for sanctuary.

The chairman of the committee states to me in a remark on the side that the question would be still left to be decided. Not so. The language of the bill is language of exclusion; and incorporated in the class of people who are to be excluded are persons who have been convicted of or who at the time of seeking admission to the United States are legally charged with a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Under the clause which the Senator is discussing, who is to pass upon the question whether or not the charge involves moral turpitude?

Mr. REED. Manifestly, the immigration inspector.

Mr. BORAH. I think that is as serious an objection as the other. The Supreme Court of the United States some time ago sustained the decision of an immigration inspector and the department, which had for its effect the exclusion from the United States of a native-born citizen, and he was denied the privilege of presenting to the courts of the country the question as to whether or not he was a native-born citizen. In other words, the court sustained the decision of the department as being conclusive as against a man who was prepared to prove that he was a native-born citizen of the United States, and he was excluded. I think it is a very dangerous power to lodge in a mere department officer. In the dissenting opinion, Justice Brewer said: "Such a decision is to my mind appalling." I agree with the learned justice—such a vicious principle of bureaucracy engrafted on our free institutions is appalling.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me, I think it will be conceded by every Member of this body that the administrative features of the bill—and this is one of them—must be lodged in some competent body. I presume our immigration officers charged with this duty are selected with due regard for their fitness to enter into the merits of any particular case. While there may be from time to time some hardship or perhaps some injustice by virtue of the administration of the law, nevertheless it seems to me to be practically impossible so to define the law as to make it perfect in its letter without leaving something to the judgment of those charged with its administration.

The reason why we wrote in this clause was that it seemed absurd to think that anybody seeking to come to the United States would admit that he had been guilty of that which under the terms of our law would unfit him to enter; and we put in this clause, "legally charged," so that in case he came duly to trial and was cleared of the charge he could then enter, and if convicted, by the very text of the law of 1907, he could not enter.

Therefore it seemed to me that this was the very language we should use, because if he were legally charged he would be then under indictment, and if convicted under the terms of the old law he could not come in. If we are going to make the United States an asylum to which felons and those who may escape the processes of the courts may come and enter, why, then, let us leave out this language.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina permit a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to ask if it is not a fact that under the treaties existing between the United States and European countries any person coming here who was under an indictment would be secured and returned?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is my understanding.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, in view of that case, is there any necessity of incorporating this amendment in the bill? I am not certain that it should not be done. I am merely asking for information.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should think this language would often help expedite matters, and would largely tend to obviate the necessity of going through the process of extradition papers, and so forth, because if there is lodged against the individual a legal charge which would unfit him for entry if he should be convicted of it, it seems to me it would be only paying proper respect to other nations which have processes of courts such as ours. A culprit fleeing from this country and going abroad would be excluded there if in their immigration law they were to incorporate a provision that if he was legally charged he could not enter. It seems to me the language here is the proper language to use in the premises.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, among my early recollections is laid up this fact: Having attended a public school, the president of the school board being an old Bohemian who had fled to this country and whose estates had been confiscated because of a rebellion against the authority of Austria, I have not the slightest doubt that he was charged with high treason and charged in a legal form; nearly all of his compatriots were executed, and I have not the slightest doubt but that if this law had been in existence an immigration agent would have stopped him at the shores of our country and sent him back to his death. Yet, of all the men I have ever known upon this earth, I have regarded him as one of the most intelligent, most patriotic, most moral.

This matter ought to be approached in a grave frame of mind at this particular moment. All Europe is aflame with war. Armies are marching and countermarching across devastated countries. The King of Belgium and the remnant of the Belgian Army are fighting on soil that is foreign to them. We are told by the press—whether truthfully or not I can not say—that the spirit of revolt against what these peoples regard as oppression is aflame in many of the Provinces of Austria, or in many of the smaller subdivisions that make up Austria. Before this war is over, or when it is over, it is entirely probable that thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of people will seek refuge in this country, undertaking to escape from the courts and military tribunals of a conquering power; and all that will be necessary in order to compel this Government to return them, if this bill be passed in this form, will be for the monarch who has

achieved victory to file with our immigration agents a list of the men against whom some charge has been lodged and the poor victim must be returned. He will have no power to go into one of our courts and assert that his offense was purely a political one, and that instead of being a crime it was an act of the highest patriotism. He will be entitled to be represented by no counsel, for, at least in some parts of this bill, it is provided that the hearing before the commissioners shall be a secret hearing. The merits of his case will not be passed upon by a judge or by a jury, but he will be taken before an immigration agent. We deny to that immigration agent any discretion whatever in the premises. Being an administrative officer, all he can do is to follow the letter of the law. The letter of the law as we write it is that if a legal charge has been filed involving a felony the immigrant must be returned to the country from which he came. That may result in sending back to their death or to long terms of imprisonment thousands of the best people of Europe.

As the phrase stood in the House bill, and as I understand it stands in the present law, the man must have been convicted, or he must admit his guilt. To be convicted of a crime or to admit guilt of a crime is a very different thing from being merely charged with a crime. To be denied access to this country because you have been convicted of a crime or admit a crime is a very different thing from being denied access to it because some officer has put a charge against you.

I am not familiar with the methods of procedure in those countries, but I think it is safe to assume that they do not more carefully guard the interests of their subject people than we guard the interests of our citizens. In many of the States of this country a mere prosecuting officer may file a charge. It may not be sustained by a single scintilla of substantial evidence. It may be false in every particular. If such an officer existed in Europe—and probably they have officers with similar and even more arbitrary powers—the mere signing of the name of that officer to a charge deprives the victim of refuge in this land, and the enactment of this law deprives our courts and our Government of any right to investigate as to the truth of the matter.

The effort to exclude foreigners—that is the purpose of this bill—those who are its authors, in my opinion, would gladly close the doors of this country forever to every man born upon foreign soil.

I beg of the committee and of the Senate, particularly at this period of the world's strife, not to enact a law that may turn back patriots, lovers of liberty, soldiers who have fought in defense of their country and their homes, thereby sending them to the prison, the scaffold, or the block.

I have no sympathy with a proposition of that kind. It ought not to be enacted at this time of all others. If the committee will recast this proposition, leaving the refugee the right to appear before some tribunal presided over by a judge, and there demonstrate the fact that he is a good citizen and a good man, and that the charge against him is a false charge, I shall make no complaint. I hope the committee will consider this matter, however; and I ask the chairman of the committee if he is not willing to have this particular amendment passed over for further consideration by the committee?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hardly think there is any additional comment needed on this particular paragraph. I have listened to what the Senator from Missouri has had to say. I do not think that the United States should be charged with or should assume the burden of passing upon the legal processes of other countries. I think all our treaties and laws in our relationship with them should recognize their due processes of law as we would insist that they should recognize ours. If one who is legally charged with crime desires to come here, as a matter of course the moment the case is decided, if he is convicted, the automatic operation of the law already in force debars him. If he is acquitted the doors are wide open to him. We have recognized the processes of law of other countries, and we expect them to recognize ours. I see no possible objection to this amendment.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, though a member of the committee, I have no recollection of having been present at any hearing when this particular paragraph was under discussion. I very strongly disapprove of it. The only excuse for its insertion is to enable the immigration officers to learn something regarding the character of the alien, and from this language his character is presumed to be bad, because he has been accused of the commission of a crime. It does violence to the law on the subject of character as applied, I believe, in every State court of the United States and in the Federal courts of the Nation, because no witness will be required to answer a question regarding accusations that may have been made against

him, and all the courts hold that the mere accusation, the mere finding of an indictment, no matter how serious the crime, can not be regarded as impeaching the character of the individual. If he has been arrested, if he has been imprisoned, that may be regarded as bearing upon his character, but the bill as amended by the committee contemplates that the mere accusation against an alien charging him with some act of moral turpitude shall in itself be sufficient to stamp him as a man of unworthy character and unfit to be admitted into the United States.

I think that the provision placed in the bill by the House is a good provision and that it ought to be retained. In substance, it declares that any person convicted of a crime or who admits his guilt shall be excluded. The suggestion has just been made by the chairman of the committee that if he has been accused by a foreign government of the commission of an offense that ought to be sufficient to exclude him. If he has been indicted under foreign law and the foreign government is anxious to secure his presence to proceed with the prosecution, that can be accomplished by an entirely different law—by our treaty regulations—by which we recognize the right of extraditing a citizen of this country who has been accused and perhaps indicted under the laws of some foreign government for the commission of an offense.

If the chairman does not think it proper to defer the further consideration of this provision at this time, I shall ask to have the House provision stand and the committee amendment rejected.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, as I construe this amendment it in effect provides that where a subject of some other nation has been charged with a crime under the laws of his own country he shall not be admitted. I think that is a perfectly just provision. Why should this Government under those circumstances take upon itself the burden of trying a man and determining whether he is guilty or innocent? It is entirely proper that he should be returned to his own country where the charge is made against him and there have him tried. Looking at it in that way I see no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. REED. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WALSH. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment. The Secretary will call the roll upon agreeing to the amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He is not in the Chamber, and I will withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. THORNTON (when Mr. RANDELL's name was called). I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. RANDELL] on public business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COIT] to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], who is absent. On that account I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to announce the following pairs:

The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]; and

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

Mr. HOLLIS. I announce my pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

Mr. MYERS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. Has he voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] on official business and also to state that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. How those Senators would vote if present I do not know.

Mr. JAMES. I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is absent on official business of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. OWEN. I wish to transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. DU PONT. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Dillingham	Lodge	Root	Sterling
Fletcher	McCumber	Sheppard	Thornton
Gallinger	Norris	Sherman	White
Gore	Overman	Simmons	Williams
Hardwick	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	Works
James	Page	Smith, Ga.	
Jones	Perkins	Smith, S. C.	

NAYS—30.

Bankhead	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Stone
Borah	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Camden	La Follette	Reed	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lane	Saulsbury	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Shields	Walsh
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Warren
du Pont	Myers	Smith, Mich.	
Gronna	Nelson	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—40.

Ashurst	Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell
Brady	Colt	Lee, Md.	Robinson
Brandeggee	Crawford	Lewis	Shafroth
Bristow	Culbertson	McLean	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Fall	Martin, Va.	Stephenson
Burleigh	Goff	Newlands	Sutherland
Burton	Hollis	Oliver	Swanson
Catron	Hughes	Penrose	Townsend
Chilton	Johnson	Pittman	Vardaman
Clapp	Kern	Polindexter	Weeks

So the amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Immigration was, in section 3, page 5, line 13, after the word "turpitude," to strike out "polygamist" and insert "polygamists."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 6, line 6, after the word "who," to insert "directly or indirectly"; in line 6, after the word "to," to strike out "bring in" and insert "procure or import"; in line 7, after the word "or," to strike out "women or girls" and insert "persons"; and in line 8, after the word "any," to strike out "others" and insert "other"; so as to read:

Prostitutes, or persons coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who directly or indirectly procure or attempt to procure or import prostitutes or persons for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who are supported by or receive in whole or in part the proceeds of prostitution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 6, line 17, after the word "unskilled," to insert "mental or manual," so as to read:

Persons hereinafter called contract laborers, who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, express

or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled, mental or manual.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 7, line 15, after the word "existing," to strike out "treaties or," so as to read:

Unless otherwise provided for by existing agreements as to passports, or by treaties, conventions, or agreements that may hereafter be entered into.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 9, line 4, after the word "dialect," to strike out:

No two aliens coming in the same vessel or other vehicle of carriage or transportation shall be tested with the same slip.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the amendment just adopted, by which the words "mental or manual" were inserted in the bill, did not, as it seems to me, in giving the subject hurried consideration, receive the consideration of the Senate that its importance required. I find it exceedingly difficult to understand upon what consideration we ought to exclude a teacher from this country because he comes here under an agreement to teach. Ought not the universities of this country be permitted to engage teachers in foreign countries?

Mr. LODGE. That is in the existing law. The admission of persons of the character the Senator describes is all provided for.

Mr. WALSH. What was the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. I say, the admission of such persons as the Senator describes is provided for in the exceptions which are now in the present law and which have been there for years.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to be advised of the qualifications.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Montana will turn to the top of page 11, he will find this language:

Provided further, That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries.

Mr. WALSH. Then, I desire to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, with these exceptions, what is the significance of the language "mental or manual"?

Mr. LODGE. From what page is the Senator from Montana reading?

Mr. WALSH. I am reading from page 6.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that is the old contract-labor law, to which those I have named are exceptions. Those three words were added on the suggestion of the department simply to make the law clear. All the rest of the language is the existing law, and has been the law for many years. They are found in what is known as the contract-labor law, which antedates any immigration legislation. The language was intended to prevent the importation of contract labor of any sort.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator from Massachusetts will attend to the question I addressed to him, I desire to say that I observe all of the qualifications referred to on page 11. It does not extend to professional actors, artists, lecturers, or singers. I should like to know, when all those classes are excluded, what classes are included within the term "mental," as found in line 17, on page 6?

Mr. LODGE. All persons who come in under contract who are not included in the exceptions.

Mr. WALSH. But will the Senator from Massachusetts kindly indicate some who would fall within that class?

Mr. LODGE. In the first place, all manual laborers—

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes; but I am speaking about those who would be excluded by the language added—"mental or manual."

Mr. LODGE. Well, there is a large body of manual employments that are not included in the exceptions.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have here a communication from the Attorney General asking that this language be clarified, which I find included in the notes on the amendment, saying that very often it was hard for the courts to determine where skilled labor was employed and no actual manual labor done, whether such a laborer came under the terms of the contract-labor law. He asked that the law be clarified, and therefore the committee has recommended the insertion of the words "mental or manual."

Mr. WALSH. But we do not get any answer to the question. What I want is some concrete case.

Mr. LODGE. A clerk in a bank, for instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I can give another case; at least, it looks to me like one. It looks to me as if it would exclude an engineer with whom contracts were made for the purpose of doing engineering work in the United States. Engineers might

have the highest mental qualifications and their services might be of the very utmost necessity and public advantage at a certain time. So, if you are going to put the word "mental" in where it has been inserted on the page to which the Senator from Montana calls attention, the list of those who are to be exempted ought to be extended. You ought not, for example, to exclude from this country an expert accountant, nor ought you to exclude a civil or a mining or an electrical engineer. If the law is to be in spirit and in sympathy with the old contract-labor law, either the words "mental or manual" ought to be left out, leaving the language subject to the construction which it has already received, or else the list of those who are made exceptions to it on page 11 ought to be somewhat extended.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the purpose of the law is to exclude labor contracted for in a foreign country at a very low rate, a lower rate than is paid in this country. As I have said, this law, with the exceptions, has been on the statute books for many years. The words "mental or manual" were inserted because there has been a great deal of trouble under the existing law in efforts to confine it to manual laborers. The purpose of the law, I repeat, is to exclude contract labor, except in certain cases, and to prevent the making of contracts abroad at lower rates than are paid in the United States. Of course it is for the Senate to say whether they will enlarge the exceptions. I think the contract-labor law is an extremely valuable law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is no one more heartily in sympathy with the whole spirit and purpose of the contract-labor law than myself, and I do not desire to subject myself in any degree to the imputation, which seems to be suggested, of hostility to the spirit of that act by calling attention to this particular amendment proposed by the committee. I do not think we have had very much enlightenment concerning this matter. It means something; it was undoubtedly aimed at some particular class of immigrants. What was the defect in the old law? What particular class of immigrants was allowed to come into this country that ought to have been excluded?

We all know, as a matter of course, the construction that was given to the old act by the Supreme Court of the United States. A man employed to come into this country as a preacher of the gospel was held not to fall within the condemnation of the act. Let us understand clearly if it is intended now to extend the operation of the act beyond the construction given to it by the Supreme Court of the United States, so that it shall no longer be possible to introduce teachers of that character.

I observe that the exceptions are very wide, but I still am eager to be told by some Senator of the particular class of immigrants at which this provision is aimed—what particular class will be left?

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] very pertinently suggests that a great engineer, who had distinguished himself in the conduct of great public works in one of the countries of Europe, might not come here. I recall now that the builder of the Assuan Dam upon the Nile did us the honor to pay a visit to this country only a year ago, and the hope was expressed in many quarters here that we might induce him to stay in this country, and that this Government of ours or some private individual might enter into a contract with him by which he should be assured employment in this country in the development of our great resources in one way or another. Is it intended to exclude such a man? Yet I undertake to say that some one would be heard to urge that the engineering profession is not one of the learned professions described in the exceptions? Let us assume, however, that it is; let us assume that the engineering profession would fall within the exceptions. Now, go on further, go on down the line, and tell us which is the class of immigrants that you desire to exclude by these rather cryptic words that have thus been introduced here into the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is nothing very cryptic in the words "mental or manual." They are words of common knowledge. This language is not aimed at any particular class. It was, at all events, brought to the attention of some members of the committee by the representatives of the labor organizations of this country, that without the words "mental or manual" being in the present law there were being brought into this country persons with whom contracts had been made abroad, which was defeating the purpose of the contract-labor law. That was the object. It was to make the law more explicit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What character of people would be affected?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Can the Senator state who those persons are? I am curious to know.

Mr. LODGE. I can not do that without looking back at the hearings. I think the chairman has a copy of them.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, here is the recommendation that came from the department charged with the administration of the law.

Mr. LODGE. From the present Secretary?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. From the present Commissioner of Immigration. He says:

Here is repeated the definition of "contract laborer" that is contained in section 2 of the existing immigration law. Attention is called to the opinion of the Attorney General in the McNair case (27 Opinions, 383), holding that the present law excludes only manual laborers, skilled or unskilled. I am advised that always under the act of March 3, 1903, and also under the act of February 20, 1907, until the opinion mentioned was handed down, it was the practice of the administrative officers to exclude aliens as "contract laborers" without regard to whether the work to be performed by them was of a manual or a mental nature, their idea being that "labor of any kind" included mental as well as manual occupations, and that the only exceptions permissible under the law were those specifically given in the last proviso to section 2 of the existing law (repeated in this proposed measure, lines 12-18, p. 10). That construction of section 2 of the existing law seems to be approved (obiter dicta, at least) in the decision of the Supreme Court January 5, 1914, in *Lapina v. Williams*. Since the date of the opinion of the Attorney General above mentioned an effort has been made to apply the law to "manual" laborers only; but it is often practically impossible to determine whether the mental or manual elements predominate in particular occupations, especially those that are skilled; and there can be no doubt that the law was intended to protect skilled as well as unskilled laborers; in fact, it was enacted and from time to time amended largely to meet demands of the skilled laborers. The law should be made perfectly plain by inserting after the words "labor * * * of any kind," (p. 6, lines 2-3), the words "mental or manual."

That was the point made by the Commissioner of Immigration—that it would be well to clarify the law and make it perfectly plain so that the courts would not be called upon to differentiate which element, manual or mental, predominated in skilled labor. If the predominance was mental, under existing law the laborer was not included in the prohibition against "contract labor." The amendment was designed to clarify that by including in the contract-labor law those who performed mental as well as those who performed manual labor; that is all. That is the recommendation of the department, and that is the reason for the insertion of the words "mental or manual."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think it would be a very serious mistake to amend the law as proposed. There has been a recognized evil in this country, which grew out of the wholesale importation of labor from abroad, that became a menace to the labor at home. There is every reason for the public sentiment in this country against the importation of contract labor, either skilled or unskilled, of a manual character; but there is no sentiment in this country against acquiring citizens from abroad who will add to the productive capacity of this country by reason of the mental ability which they bring to us.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the only limitation put on their coming in is that they should not make a contract before they come in.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, there is no reason for that, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. I think there is a pretty good reason for it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is no reason why, if a great engineer develops in Europe—

Mr. LODGE. That is covered by the exception of the learned professions.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I doubt it. There can be no objection to bringing into this country a man who has attained great ability as a manager of a certain line of manufacturing. That man becomes an asset to this country when he comes here to promote and develop a manufacturing industry which will give employment to labor and open a new line of industry in this country. There can be no possible objection, in my mind, to bringing into this country that superior class of people who would be a distinct advantage and help to the country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will allow me to interrupt him, he will admit, I presume, that those are rare and exceptional cases and are not so very vital to the interests of this country. An American, working up steadily to attain the mental fitness for the discharge of high functions in his employment, stands face to face with the possibility of being confronted by one of equal ability from abroad who is willing to accept the position at less wages. Such cases may and do probably occur every day. An American who wants to improve his process of manufacture can go abroad and get the benefit of any new device or new idea, while the laborer who by his own industry and his own effort has worked himself up to where he is in a position to earn a higher wage is met at the threshold of his promotion by some one from abroad who is willing to take the place under contract at a less figure. I do not think that is fair.

We have made the exceptions in the bill as broad as we could make them, and propose to leave them to the good sense and judgment of those charged with the administration of the law; but it has been deemed wise, by the insertion of the proposed amendment, to meet the requirements of that aspiring class who desire to rise from the ranks of manual labor to the grade of skilled mental and manual labor and to protect them from the competition of the overcrowded population of the old world, where by some accident a man may have the same opportunity and may come here and take advantage of what has been done by the American and get his job.

That, I think, was the idea of the committee; that, in order to protect and encourage that class, the words "mental and manual" should be put into the law.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator has answered himself when he has stated that this amendment will only affect rare cases. If it only affects rare cases, it is not necessary.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Oh, no; the Senator misunderstood me. I said the cases he cited would be rare. I say that a case where some exceptional intellect discovers a new process and wants to enter into contract to come over here and give us the benefit of something we know nothing about would be rare.

In that case, if the foreigner has something that we do desire, he can come to this country and make a contract after he comes, because American ingenuity is such, and it has such a way of looking to the main chance, that when such a man does come, if he makes good, he can enter into contract after he comes; but if the manufacturers of this country, in order not to pay just compensation, or, I will say, compensation that should be the reward of one working from the manual ranks up into the mental as well as the manual, contract for similar labor at a lower price, and bring it to this country, what incentive have you held out to the American wageworker? What incentive do we hold out to a boy working as a floor sweeper and desiring to advance higher, if you leave the door wide open for the foreigner, who has already attained that skill, to come to this country under contract and compete with him? That is the point.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The possible evil which the Senator states has, in my opinion, no existence in fact. Any man in this country who is possessed of energy and ambition, and has the real development of an idea, has no difficulty in finding a market for the services he can render. The people of this country who are unable to find a market for their services are those who have common labor and those whose labor is so unskilled as not to possess a high productive value.

This country opens an unquestioned field to the man who really has something of great value to contribute to the industrial world. I can very well imagine a case where a German chemist, for instance, possessed of the secrets of German chemistry, which are known to excel those of any other country, might be brought to this country, and that man alone introduced into an industry might result in giving employment to thousands of other people and building up in this country a great industry now monopolized by Germany.

I will follow this illustration a little further. The Senator well knows the preeminence of Germany in the matter of chemistry. It is admitted that this country is comparatively dependent upon Germany, and has been for many years, for certain dyestuffs used in our manufactures. If we transplant to this country the learning and the knowledge of those German chemists there is no reason why we can not build up those industries in this country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator knows that ample provision is made on page 11 for the exemption of that class of people.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I think not. I think just such a man might be excluded from this country by some inspector in New York who would hold that he was to engage in mental labor in this country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; but he would have to be under contract; and any man who has a new process that he wants to promulgate in this country would have no difficulty in finding a ready market for it after getting here if it was worth the market. It is the class who are contracted for to engage in already established work who are excluded.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is again mistaken. I will stick to my illustration. Take the German chemist employed in a German chemical works who realizes that he is assured a profitable maintenance for life. He will not come to this country upon a peradventure and give up the assurance which he has at home. He may be induced to come only when he is

assured in advance of a permanent and a lasting employment in this country at a good salary. On the other hand, the common German laborer, crushed down by conditions in his country, will come here because he can not be any worse off here than he is there. So we have found that common labor comes to this country in excessive quantities.

One of the things from which this country is suffering at the present time, and one from which it has suffered at different periods, and always at recurring periods, is the excess of common labor, while one of the reasons why Germany has been developed to such a great degree of prosperity is that during the 44 years of the Empire Germany has utterly changed her labor conditions. When the Empire was established two-thirds of all German labor was common labor, and only one-third was skilled labor. To-day two-thirds of all the labor in Germany is skilled labor, and only one-third is common labor. The productiveness of the Empire has been enormously increased; and that has been possible in part by reason of the fact that Germany has developed intellectual men who are skilled, and who may come under this title of skilled labor of a mental sort.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator a question? Is he advised as to whether Germany imported these skilled laborers, these chemists and professors, or did she develop them herself?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know. I am not prepared to answer that question, because I can not, but I do not think it has anything to do with the case. My opinion is this: Undoubtedly, if Germany finds that America excels in a certain line of development she will import those skilled Americans. Undoubtedly, if Germany finds that England has developed a certain art or a certain line of manufacture or a certain industry to a high point she will import the Englishman skilled in that line, or permit him to come, and come by contract. Germany has grasped all the good she found anywhere in the world for the purpose of her own development, and I think America should follow that policy. We should not shut our gates and bar our entrances to people who can come here and build up the industries of this country by the intellectual development which they have already attained.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator allow me to read him the provision that follows this very proposed amendment?

The provision next foregoing, however—

Referring to this one—

shall not apply to persons of the following status or occupations: Government officers, ministers or religious teachers, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, civil engineers, teachers, students, authors, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is for the very reason that this country is not suffering from an evil growing out of an excessive supply of those persons. The thing we are suffering from is an excessive supply of common labor, and sometimes of skilled labor of certain kinds. We never suffer from an excessive supply of what may be called intellectual or mental labor.

I think the amendment of the bill in this particular, whatever its purpose may be, is aimed at something which is not an evil and is likely to introduce into the bill a new provision which may be used to our detriment. Certainly there has been no showing of any existing evil which will justify a change in the present law in that respect.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will venture to ask my friend the Senator from Nebraska if the fact that skilled labor has so largely increased in Germany, is not probably due to the wonderful system of technical schools in that Empire?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no doubt of it. It has been the steady purpose of the German Government to develop its labor and raise it to a higher standard. The skilled laborer had an immense productiveness more than the unskilled laborer.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when the committee come to consider this matter further, I think they will be inclined to yield somewhat. By the insertion of the word "mental" they have greatly broadened the scope of the present contract-labor law. That law was intended, as has been said, to reach manual labor. It was so broadly drawn in the first instance that a minister employed by a church in New York—Trinity Church—was under its provisions sought to be excluded. The Supreme Court of the United States held that he could be admitted, but the court, in order to reach that conclusion, went back to the purpose of the law and really worked some ravishment upon the language of the section itself. I wish, however, to call the

attention of the chairman of the committee and the committee itself to one immediate effect of this proposed amendment.

We have just passed a banking and currency bill which authorizes the banks of this country to establish branch banks in foreign countries. Also we have otherwise vastly enlarged the ability of our banks to engage in international financial transactions. Already branch banks are being established in South American countries. If this amendment becomes a law, our banks maintaining branches in South America can not go to South America and employ men who are skilled in its finances and bring them here to enable them properly to carry on their South American business.

With all due respect to the committee, I do not think it wise to pass such a law. It is no answer whatever to say that somebody might drift up here from South America in search of employment, and might find his way into one of these banks and it might secure his services. What it is undoubtedly necessary for these banks to do is at once to acquire in their working forces in this country men who are familiar with the banking and financial operations of the countries in which it is proposed to establish branches. The broad language of the amendment would stop that, and the broad prohibition is made even more certain by the specific exceptions that later are written into the bill; because, under the rule that the statement of one particular exception excludes all others, it is made perfectly plain that the class of men I am referring to would be excluded.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question? Does he think, under the illustration he uses, that the courts or the administrators of this law would construe those imported from a country in which we propose to establish a bank as coming under this provision? They are imported, not for the purpose of performing contract labor here, but for the purpose of teaching the methods by which the banks are carried on at that place. The exceptions I note here are broad enough:

Teachers, * * * chemists, civil engineers.

The word "teachers" is very flexible; and under the illustration the Senator uses it seems to me that the employment of those versed in the customs and procedures of their countries would necessarily come under that head, because it would be only temporary. They would be brought here for the purpose of teaching that which does not exist here, and not under the form of a contract to perform labor that is already well established and understood here.

I will agree with the Senator from Missouri that—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds will he have the kindness to tell us where teachers are excluded?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It says "teachers."

Mr. WALSH. I do not find it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator will look on page 7, he will find it.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, the language on page 7 is very restricted in its operation. The Senator is entirely mistaken concerning the purpose of that provision.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It says "teachers, missionaries, lawyers, physicians"—

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but it says that restricts only the next preceding clause.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; the next foregoing clause.

Mr. WALSH. The next foregoing clause, which simply refers to people who can not be naturalized here; that is, Chinese and Japanese.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, answering the Senator, he does not at all meet my illustration. The man to be employed in these banks is not employed as a teacher; but, even if he were, teachers are excluded by this bill. Professors in colleges and in seminaries of learning are excepted, but not teachers—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I will ask the Senator just to wait until I can conclude the sentence, and then I will yield to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was right on that point that I wished to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. REED. This employment that I have spoken of, in a bank, is not that of calling in a man to teach others. Even if the word "teachers" were employed it would not cover the case. The National City Bank of New York, for instance, which has already established several branches, and other banks which have or may establish foreign branches, will in my opinion find it necessary to keep in their employ men who are familiar with the language, the customs, and the financial processes of each

of the countries in which they have established a branch bank. Such an expert will not be brought into the bank to hold a school of instruction, a night school, or a day school. He is brought in to work at a desk and transact business. I do not know that they have employed such people, but I know in the course of events they must be employed. I will now vary the illustration, and let us see how unwise it might be to adopt this phraseology.

We expect, under existing conditions, to extend very vastly our foreign commerce. The President has recommended in that behalf that we shall buy ships, that the Government shall go into the transportation business, and we all believe that while the industrial activities of Germany and France and England are paralyzed we may now hope to extend our trade into South American countries and there obtain a permanent foothold. Now, who will say that the first step toward the obtaining of that permanent foothold is not to acquire an intimate knowledge of the wants, habits, and customs of those people, their trade methods, their manner of doing business, and all that multitude of facts which have been hitherto gathered by the merchants of foreign countries and to which trade experts largely ascribe the success and dominance of foreign merchants in these South American countries? Which one of us is willing to say to an American manufacturer, a cotton manufacturer in the State of Georgia, "If you desire to do business in Chile you can not employ a man from that country who understands the language, habits, and customs of that people and place him in charge of the branch of your foreign trade department which deals with the people of Chile"? Who shall say to a merchant who desires to enter some other South American country, "You can not employ a man who speaks the language of the country and who is acquainted with its trade conditions"? Why should we so cripple our American merchants?

Before I take my seat I want to make one other observation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Then I will yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not want the Senator to take his seat. I only want to make a suggestion.

Mr. REED. I have always been an earnest advocate of the law that prohibits the bringing in of laborers under contract. I have always so believed and so voted. I have always denounced those who have gone to foreign lands and imported men under contract to take the places of American workingmen; but if you insert this word "mental" here, without any restriction upon its meaning otherwise than now appears in the bill, you will absolutely cut off both of the classes I have just referred to in my illustrations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I was not able to be present at a part of the discussion with reference to this language. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri his view as to the effect of the language upon a class of men that we may have an opportunity to bring here in the near future, and whose presence would be of vast benefit to the great working masses of the country. Take those classes of German scientists who have done so much in the line of developing dyestuffs and other materials, for lack of which our manufacturing enterprises have been seriously troubled during the past 90 days. Would this language prevent the employment of an expert chemist from Germany who might be needed in this country to aid in inaugurating some line of chemical process necessary to our industries for which we now depend upon Germany; and if it would, is it not probable that all the members of the committee would prefer that it should not go that far?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator is a great lawyer, and in answering his question I need only to read the language of the bill. I call his attention to the opening sentence of section 3:

That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles—

And so forth.

Then follows a long list, including procurers, prostitutes, and people of that class. Then follows this language:

Persons hereinafter called contract laborers, who have been induced assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled, mental or manual.

Now, if that language stands, it will exclude every person of every kind and every character who comes here under any kind of contract, solicitation, or inducement. Turning then to the exceptions which are found on page 11:

Provided, That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude—

What? Chemists, engineers, teachers, people of that kind? Not at all. It shall not be held to exclude—

professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession—

Which, I take it, means preachers, doctors, and lawyers—

or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants accompanying their employer.

That means, first, we exclude everybody, and then we except from the rule of exclusion certain particular classes, and in the exception there is nothing that will include the skilled chemist of Germany; there is nothing that will include the skilled engineer; there is nothing that will include the man who is skilled in banking or in merchandising or is familiar with the trade conditions of another country and is brought here because of his expert knowledge. Manifestly, if we pass this bill as recommended by the committee, we deny to this country access to these highly intelligent, scientific classes of people, who undoubtedly we ought to bring here for the purpose of gaining the benefit of their skill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will look on page 10, he will find this proviso:

Provided further, That skilled labor, if otherwise admissible, may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country, and the question of the necessity of importing such skilled labor in any particular instance may be determined by the Secretary of Labor upon the application of any person interested, such application to be made before such importation, and such determination by the Secretary of Labor to be reached after a full hearing and an investigation into the facts of the case.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does that language answer the question "If labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country"? Who will say that among the 90,000,000 people some chemist may not be found who could make the dyestuffs? Yet who would confine the industries of the country to the employment of that one man? Besides, who will assert that a skilled chemist comes under the term "skilled laborer"?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Would the term "skilled laborer" be applied to a student of science?

Mr. REED. I think not. I think the term "skilled labor" has its meaning. "Skilled laborer" here is intended to be applied to mechanics.

I hold that this is true. We ought to rigidly exclude those who come here under contract to perform manual labor, skilled or unskilled, because they are brought in here to compete with thousands and tens of thousands of our citizens duly qualified to perform that task. That is the evil we are striking at, and we are striking at no other evil. But if a foreign chemist could be brought to this country to assist in the establishment of manufactures of dyestuffs so that our country would no longer be dependent upon a foreign manufacturer for its supply, would injury result to our labor? The man would take no one's place here, because if we had chemists who could do the work effectually there would be already in this country manufactures of the kind I am referring to. If such an industry were established by a skilled foreigner, it would make employment for a great many of the skilled and unskilled laborers of our land. It would generally increase employment for our labor and multiply our wealth.

Moreover, suppose we were about to erect a great building or monument and some foreign architect whose dream of utility and beauty far surpassed that of any of our own people should present his plans and offer his services; why should we deny to our country that splendid monument of genius and accept an inferior article? This very Capitol Building sprang from the brain of a man born upon foreign soil. Many, indeed the vast majority of all the works of art that have added glory and beauty to the halls and temples of our land come from the magic brush or chisel of some foreign artist.

It is unwise to put in this sweeping inhibition. Certainly if it is to be used the list of excepted employments ought to be greatly enlarged.

Suppose there is some great engineer, let us say a Belgian engineer or a German engineer or a French engineer, a man capable of conceiving the Suez or the Panama Canal, and because of the present untoward conditions in Europe he should desire to have employment here, but would not want to come simply searching from house to house for work, what objection is there to adding to the knowledge of this country the wealth of his intellectual achievement? Why not bring him?

Those men who have made countries great have not done it by the policy of exclusion. If you ask me who laid the foundations of Germany's greatness and power, who made it possible that that nation should become so great that it is feared by other nations, I would answer, Frederick the Great. No sooner had that wonderful man established peace by arms than he

invited to his court the intellect of the earth, the scholar, the statesman, the philosopher, the artist, the musician; thus he transformed his people and laid the foundation for a civilization that has advanced from that day to this and has created a country that were it not for the shadow of militarism which hangs over it would be an almost ideal land.

Mr. President, let us not adopt so narrow a policy.

My attention has just been called by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] to the fact that many of those men who are now rendering great assistance to Thomas A. Edison in his wonderful inventions are Germans who came here and secured employment with him. We are so infinitely narrow in all this, we talk about people who happen to be born on the other side of the red line of a map as though they were not God Almighty's children, as though the same red blood does not flow in their veins, the same impulses thrill their hearts, the same ambitions inspire their souls, and the same tender sentiments animate their lives as thrill and sanctify our own.

Sitting now in the chair of the Senate [Mr. NELSON in the chair] is a man born under the flag of another country, who told me—and I think a repetition not indelicate—that when he arrived here he had but two or three dollars in his possession. He could not speak our language. He had no rich protectors. Yet he has been the governor of a great State and for many years its Senator. In this body he ranks in patriotism, in intelligence, and in learning with the best of its Members. When the call came for soldiers to defend the land of his adoption he took his place on the red line of battle, and it is not recorded that he did not fight as good a fight as any of the proud Americans who happened to be of the second or third generation of foreigners who located here.

This bill is framed upon the idea that if a white man happens to be born under any other flag than ours he is therefore not fit to live under this flag. I confess the doctrine nauseates me. It is narrow. It is the philosophy of cowardice. It is a cry from the lips of the man who is afraid of competition.

I see sitting across the Chamber from me another man born under the flag of a foreign country. He also has been selected by the people of his State to come here and represent them in this Senate, which we boastfully denominate the greatest deliberative body on earth. As I look at the faces of these two men I ask, What is the difference between them and some one whose ancestors emigrated here a few years earlier? Are not their countenances as clear cut, their foreheads as high, their eyes as fearless, their hearts as stout, their brains as keen, their courage as high, their patriotism as lofty as those of us whose ancestors came here a generation or two earlier? Yet when they came, at the very hour they were landing, there were proscriptionists warning the country against the pauper hordes who were invading our blessed land and about to destroy it.

When the Irish came from that stricken land where proscriptive laws denied the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, closed their factories, shut the doors of learning in the face of ambition; when the Irish came here, driven by want and famine and proscription and tyranny; when they came in rags and tatters; when they came holding out hands, not for bread, but for work, there were a great many of the aristocrats of America who denounced them as a pauper horde, ignorant, besotted, unfit for citizenship. Yet but a few years had passed until Irish orators were thrilling the hearts of American audiences with the music and power and force of their eloquence. Irish songsters were turning the air to melody. Irish statesmen were crowding into the Halls of Congress and into the Senate, and Irish merchants were making themselves princes in the marts of trade.

When the German tide of immigration swept into this country and when Holland poured a flood of her citizenry into our ports, the proscriptionist again stood with sour visage and denounced these people. They came and established themselves in colonies, and then it was discovered that they filled our farms with a citizenship that was superb and unsurpassed; that they crowded into our colleges and seminaries of learning; that they brought with them music and art and letters and, with all, the sturdy citizenship that maintained the law and upheld the flag. They are in my State by the thousand. There is no protest from my State.

The protest comes from States which have no foreign population to speak of. You do not hear it from the State of Minnesota. Yet if you had traveled through that State a few years ago you would have found vast and unsettled prairies, scarcely regarded as fit for the habitation of men. A few years later you would have found Swedes and Norwegians and Danes by the tens of thousands—men who could not speak our tongue, yet who were sending their children to the public schools, who were cultivating the soil, who were building homes, who were estab-

lishing industries, who were creating banks, who were becoming merchants. Travel over that State to-day and you will meet a people you can not distinguish from what we are pleased to term the American citizen. They speak our tongue; they wear the same habiliments; they think the same thoughts; they follow the same system of education; they worship at the same throne of grace; and if this country were involved in war, they would stand on the red line side by side with the American aristocrat whose ancestors happened to come here a little sooner than they did.

And now it is proposed to exclude the "mental," the intellectual, if, forsooth, some one in this country, having discovered the necessity for that particular variety of mentality, has said to its possessor, "If you will come to America, a place awaits you." That, sir, is a narrow policy. It is an un-American policy.

Mr. President, where did this American race come from? I am glad it was my privilege to be born under the Old Flag. Sometimes I feel a little pride in the fact that at least a portion of my ancestors were here before the Revolutionary War. Yet I am no prouder of that than I am of that other branch which came here at a later period and, having come, demeaned themselves as honest folk.

But when I see men with curled lip denouncing these children of misfortune who were born under other skies and who from love of liberty turn the eyes of hope toward our shores, I ask the proud aristocrat whence he came, how long it has been since his ancestors escaped from the same lands of oppression. What, pray, is his pedigree? I am reminded as I stand here of a few lines from, I think, that classical poem by John G. Saxe, entitled "The Proud Miss MacBride"—a legend of Gotham—and they run like this:

Of all the notable things on earth,
The queerest one is pride of birth.
Among our "fierce Democracy!"
A bridge across a hundred years,
Without a prop to save it from sneers—
Not even a couple of rotten peers—
A thing of laughter, sneers, and jeers,
Is American aristocracy!

English and Irish, French and Spanish,
German, Italian, Dutch, and Danish,
Crossing their veins until they vanish
In one conglomeration!
So subtle a tangle of blood, indeed,
No modern Harvey will ever succeed
In finding the circulation!

Depend upon it, my snobbish friend,
Your family thread you can't ascend,
Without good reason to apprehend
You may find it waxed at the farther end
By some plebeian vocation;
Or, worse than that, your boasted line
May end in a loop of stronger twine
That plagued some worthy relation!

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the evil that we are attempting to legislate against in this section of the bill is the contracting in advance with foreign laborers to be brought to this country to compete with native or American laborers. It is not intended to prevent any citizen of any other country from coming here a free man to labor in this country at such wages as he may be able to procure. The intent of it is to prevent the bringing into this country of laborers at wages less than those prevailing in our own country. What difference does it make, sir, whether a man happens to be a skilled laborer or a common, ordinary laborer? There is no reason why a banker should be allowed to employ some skilled laborer to come into this country at a wage based upon the standard of wages of another country, less than that fixed by our own standard of wages, any more than there is why a man or a corporation should be permitted to employ a common laborer to come here for the same purpose.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], whom we all love and respect, and who has been so eloquently referred to by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], did not come to this country as a contract laborer; he came here a perfectly free man, at liberty to procure the wages that could be obtained in the country to which he had immigrated. He would not be excluded by the provisions of this bill; neither would anyone coming here, whether a skilled or a common laborer, who was not bound in advance to labor for wages that had been contracted for, and, we may assume, contracted for upon the basis of the standard of wages existing, not in this country, but in his own country.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the exemptions from the effects of this clause in the bill are too broad. So long as anyone comes here to enter upon a business where there is no competition, where there is no fixed standard of wages, the reason

for this sort of legislation ceases; but if there is a fixed standard of wages, for instance, in the case of engineers, there is no reason why anybody should be allowed to go to a foreign country, contract there for an engineer, and bring him into this country at a less wage than he could obtain upon fair competition in this country when he reaches it. It is that very evil, Mr. President, that we are attempting to avoid in this kind of legislation.

The illustrations presented by the Senator from Missouri, and the hardships that might result from a provision of this kind, are purely imaginary. Does anybody suppose, for example, that we can not procure the necessary ability in the way of engineering in this country without going to any foreign country to obtain it, or that we can not find competent chemists or men in any of the other lines of endeavor mentioned by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WORKS. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to inquire of the Senator from California whether he would desire to have the bill prevent the introduction into this country under employment of skilled foreign engineers?

Mr. WORKS. I should object to any kind of labor being brought into this country under a contract fixing the wage to be paid.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly. I agree with the Senator about that; but that is not the question. I thought that I had got the Senator's attitude to be—and I wanted to be assured about it—that he was specifically opposed to the introduction of foreign engineers or of foreign chemists under contract.

Mr. WORKS. It is fair to presume, Mr. President, that if a contract is made in a foreign country it will be based upon the wage to be paid in that country. The engineer, or whoever it may be, is not likely to exact a higher wage than that existing in his own country; and it is an injustice to the laborers of this country to bring anyone here, whether he be a skilled or an unskilled laborer, at a wage less than he could obtain in fair competition in our own country. I am opposed to that, whether it be in the case of a common laborer or of the man who labors mentally or a skilled laborer of any kind.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the explanation originally given of the significance of this amendment was that it was exceedingly difficult to draw the line in the case of many vocations between mental and manual labor, and that it was difficult to determine which particular variety of labor predominated in the work the laborer was called upon to do. Of course, everybody must recognize that that difficulty does exist. A mining engineer, for instance, is called upon oftentimes to perform exceedingly arduous manual labor; the constructing engineer, an engineer laying out a great railroad, is often called upon to do the most severe character of manual labor, and yet it might easily be determined that in the case of both of those vocations the mental labor is the particular part for which the employment is made. It is easy to recognize that in many cases it is difficult to determine; but, Mr. President, it does seem to me that that is just exactly where we ought to draw the line; that we ought resolutely to exclude all those who come here under contract who are to engage in vocations the predominant feature of which is manual labor—that is the purpose of the contract-labor act—and that all of those who are to engage in the learned professions or in any profession or vocation where their value depends upon the intellect who can be brought into this country ought to be permitted to come under contract if it is necessary to get them in that way.

Mr. President, a number of illustrations have been given of the most desirable classes of people who would be excluded by this bill if it should become a law. I want to instance another to show the scope of this provision. In this country you have recognized for a long time how dependent the great beet-sugar industry is upon Germany for its supply of sugar-beet seed. Attention was called upon this floor some time ago to experiments—costly experiments, as I have abundant reason to know—that have been carried on in this country with a view to determine whether we could not raise in this country all our own sugar-beet seed necessary for the support of that industry. Time and again it has been disclosed upon this floor how dependent we would be if for any cause whatever the German supply should be shut off, as it was feared only a short time ago it would be.

Mr. President, extensive experiments have been carried on in my State in the last half dozen years in an effort to produce there a sugar-beet seed equal to that produced in Germany.

Why should anybody who desires to go into the sugar-beet seed business in this country be denied the opportunity to contract with a skilled man who has mastered the subject over in Germany and to bring him over here to operate a sugar-beet seed farm in this country? I should like to inquire of the Senator from California if he would like to exclude that kind of a man?

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. WORKS. I should like, first, to ask the Senator from Montana if any effort has been made to procure services of that kind by special contract?

Mr. WALSH. I am able to answer the Senator. These operations are being carried on in my State now at the Billings sugar factory; they are being conducted under the direction of a graduate of one of the German universities. He has, however, other duties to perform; this is a side line upon his part. I undertake to say that if they were told to find the proper man they would be only too glad to enter into a contract with him to get him to come over here and operate that branch of their business. Why should they be denied that opportunity?

Mr. WORKS. Then I assume that kind of a contract has been made or attempted?

Mr. WALSH. I do not know.

Mr. WORKS. The Senator from Montana has asked me whether I would object to that sort of labor being brought into this country under those circumstances. I answer very frankly I should object. There is no reason why a laborer of that kind—a mental laborer, if you please to call him so—should be allowed to contract for wages in advance to come to this country any more than the smaller man or the common laborer. The principle is precisely the same, and the reason for preventing it is precisely the same. I should not be willing to make a distinction of that kind.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, of course there is a very clear antagonism between the views of the Senator from California and my own upon that subject. I do not desire to exclude those men; that is not my idea at all of the purpose and scope of a contract-labor law. If the Senator from California takes that position with respect to the matter, I should like to know why the exception found on page 11 is in the bill at all, which excludes—

Mr. WORKS. I have already stated that, in my judgment, the exceptions are broader than they should be.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly.

Mr. WORKS. That is one of the exceptions that I should not desire to go into the bill.

Mr. WALSH. The position of the Senator from California is entirely consistent. The exceptions on page 11 are:

Professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants accompanying their employers.

Of course the Senator from California can not take the position consistently that these classes of immigrants ought to be permitted to come in under contract while the beet-sugar man should be excluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. May I inquire of the Senator from Montana whether the case that he mentions would not be met by the following provision of the bill:

Provided further, That skilled labor, if otherwise admissible, may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country.

Mr. WALSH. I will answer the Senator from Vermont very frankly about that matter. Such labor can be employed. Prof. Mendelsohn is now engaged at that labor, and he can be kept at that labor; but his duties are in an entirely different field, where he can find very profitable employment for himself and very useful employment for those who engage him. He is obliged to leave his other work in order to undertake this. He would be very glad, I undertake to say—although I do not know anything at all about that—to get some other man to handle that part of the business while he devoted himself to the general business aspects of the enterprise; in other words, Mr. President, merely because you can find a man here to take the place is no reason why the foreigner should be excluded. That is just exactly where the point comes in in the case of all manual labor. Whether it is skilled or unskilled, you find a vast body of men who do not vary much in their equipment and in their capacity; but whenever you pass that point and go into the domain of mental labor, there is no such thing as a general

dead level. Everybody recognizes that fact. Take the lawyers' profession, for instance. Would you exclude lawyers? Mr. President, I want to refer to that.

The exceptions on page 11, it will be observed, do not include any of these classes, or at least it is doubtful whether such laborers as have been spoken of by a number of those who discussed this subject would be included. The skilled chemist, the skilled agriculturist, the skilled engineer, the skilled architect—it is doubtful whether any of these would be included, because the word "profession" as used in the exception is qualified by two words. First, he must belong to one of the "learned professions," and, second, it must be not only one of the "learned professions," but it must be one of the "recognized learned professions" in order that he shall fall within the enumeration there given.

Reference was made by the chairman of the committee to an exception to be found on page 7, by which all teachers were likewise excluded from the operation of the act; but that, I think, the distinguished chairman, by a little attention to the language of the bill, will recognize is inaccurate. The bill enumerates a large number of classes of individuals who will be excluded. The class last mentioned is described in the bill on page 7, in lines 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, as follows:

Persons who can not become eligible, under existing law, to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by existing treaties or agreements as to passports, or by treaties, conventions, or agreements that may hereafter be entered into.

Then follows:

The provision next foregoing, however, shall not apply to persons of the following status or occupations—

Referring, of course, to the class of persons to which I have just adverted—

Government officers, ministers or religious teachers, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, civil engineers, teachers, students, authors, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure—

And so on.

That is to say that, notwithstanding such immigrants can not be admitted to citizenship in this country, they may still come in; but that exception does not extend at all to the immigrants from countries who would under our laws eventually be entitled to naturalization, and the only exception is that contained in the language found on page 11.

I think a further word should be said in answer to the suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with reference to the provision on page 10, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That skilled labor, if otherwise admissible, may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country, and the question of the necessity of importing such skilled labor in any particular instance may be determined by the Secretary of Labor—

And so forth.

It will be observed, Mr. President, that that contemplates a vast body of men seeking employment in that particular vocation. It can not possibly refer to such cases as would otherwise fall within the language of the amendment proposing to insert the words "manual or mental," which contemplates the exclusion of men of exceptional equipment such as have been referred to in the debate.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I made that suggestion in view of what the Senator was saying in regard to the beet-sugar industry and the necessity of having skilled men to place beet-sugar factories in operation. Similar conditions have existed in New England. I have in my mind now the establishment in Connecticut of a lace factory, the machinery for which was purchased in Europe, and there was nobody in this country who was capable of putting that machinery in operation and instructing those who were to have charge of it. There was no way of determining in advance whether a person imported for that purpose would be rejected under our laws until after the person came here and the question was raised upon his arrival. For that reason when the immigration bill was drafted two or three years ago a provision was incorporated under which that question might be raised in advance and be presented to the Secretary of Commerce with the proof, so that his action might be determined before the person was imported. In that way it would save the embarrassment, and the expense as well, of bringing a person to this country and having the matter determined after he came here. Of course if the question were determined against him he would be deported, and he would not only suffer disappointment but incur expense.

It occurred to me while the Senator was speaking that that little clause was met with in this provision, and that in the case he mentioned there would be no difficulty in applying to the Secretary for permission, making a showing, and bringing in

the skilled overseer or superintendent to whom the Senator has referred.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I feel quite certain that the provision on page 10 was intended to cover just exactly such a case as the Senator from Vermont has indicated, but I do not think that the case that has been referred to falls within that class at all. I indicated a while ago, and, following the same line of thought, I desire to observe again, that there are all kinds of gradations. As a matter of course, when it comes to vocations and those engaged in them in which the labor is chiefly mental, the differences between separate individuals ordinarily vary very much more than in the case of vocations where the work is largely manual. In the case to which I referred we have a number of gentlemen in the Agricultural Department here in Washington who have for quite a good many years been giving some considerable attention and study to the question of sugar-beet seed, and experiments have been made by companies in other States besides my own, so that it can not be said that it is impossible to get any one in this country who would be able to do the work; certain persons can be secured; but why should we deny ourselves, and why should any particular company be denied, the opportunity to get a man of preeminent qualifications, who has established his ability by reason of the success which has attended his efforts in a foreign country, and why should we be compelled to accept some man here who has not had the opportunity, as the foreign student may have had, to follow out the business to its ultimate facts? I believe that it would be a grave error to deny to our country the services of men who have climbed to the top of their profession if they desire to come here and give us and our country the benefit of their study and their thought.

Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the last amendment was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, before that vote is taken I desire to say that the committee went fully into this matter. If I may repeat what I said in the beginning of the discussion of this proposed amendment of the committee, the Commissioner of Immigration and the courts have found difficulty in drawing the line between the mental and the purely manual. I understand from the argument of the Senator who has just taken his seat that his contention is that, because of the degree of excellence that may be obtained abroad, a corporation should not be denied the opportunity of contracting for and importing skilled labor, even though labor of like kind can be found in this country. He used as an illustration, I believe, the propagation of sugar-beet seed and its culture.

The committee took the view that the incentive in this country for reaching perfection was to exclude from its borders those who, already having attained a certain skill, might preempt the ground at less wages and leave no opening for those who step by step were attaining that very skill which we want to foster in this country.

There is no member of the committee who wants to deny—and there is nothing in this bill intended to deny—this country the benefit that might come to it by reason of being able to utilize some new discovery or some process of chemistry employed, for example, in the manufacture of dyestuffs. That is not the design of this bill, nor is it intended to exclude the men who might bring such benefit, for the reason that they are professional men along skilled professional lines.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the very eloquent plea that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] made for a wide-open door for the importation of those who desire to come here.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. Referring to the illustration which was used by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] on the subject of sugar-beet seed, does the Senator contend that one who is skilled in the raising of beets or is skilled in the manufacture of dyes, and so forth, would be a professional man?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not suppose that he would; but under the bill it is provided that if skilled labor can not be found in this country to perform a certain work and we stand in need of it, it can be imported on proper application.

Mr. POMERENE. Then let me ask a further question: Would the Senator regard one who is skilled in the production of sugar beets as a skilled laborer?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would. If he is skilled in their production, the very expression implies that he is a skilled laborer.

Mr. POMERENE. But it may be that the man who has special knowledge on that subject would take no part in the manual

labor, the producing of the beets, or the growing of the stock from which the beet seed was produced. Would you still regard him as a skilled laborer?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would not regard him as an unskilled one; I would say that his knowledge comes through his labor with that plant.

Mr. President, the whole subject under discussion resolves itself into this: We have got to make laws to conform to a rule and not to the exceptions, and here we are trying to protect the great mass of the laborers of this country, skilled and unskilled. You have no right to jeopardize the wage-earning capacity of a man who, through years of industry and application to his business, has risen to a point where he can command higher wages, by permitting the importation, in competition with him, for the benefit of some temporary need of a skilled foreign artisan to take his place, for you would then have placed a penalty on skilled labor and opened it to competition; you would be saying to the man at the bottom, "We will protect you, but when you get to where your wages reach the highest point you shall come in competition with the foreigner."

As I have said, the general purpose of this bill is to protect labor from the lowest to the highest in the enjoyment of the American standard of wages. The exceptions we try to provide for by leaving the old law stand, with the exception that if there is a certain kind of work to be done and there are men in this country to do it, but they are employed, then you can import men from other countries to do the work. If it is found that there is a certain class of work that is not being carried on in this country and it is desired to import some one under contract to teach us how to do it and to install the machinery for the purpose of carrying on that work, the right is given under this provision to do that. The amendment was suggested for the purpose of protecting an entire class and not to interfere with the larger scope of the purely professional classes. The argument this morning has been along the line of exceptions that do not enter into the question as affecting the vital interests of the great body of the laborers of this country. We were trying to make a rule and then conform the law to it. We were trying to get the rule, the general aspect, and then make the law conform to that, and not trying to make the law conform to the exception.

An illustration has been suggested to me by the Senator from Oklahoma. We have a law that one must reach the age of 21 before he can vote. There is not a man on this floor but that knows thousands of cases where young men of 19 or 20 are more capable and better qualified for the exercise of the franchise than some men of 70; and yet you do not balk at the rule, because to attempt to frame a law going into all of these minute exceptions would open the door to emasculating the general application of the rule and process by which the Senate should operate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK obtained the floor.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hughes	Page	Sterling
Brandagee	James	Perkins	Stone
Burton	Jones	Pomerene	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Reed	Thomas
Cummins	Kern	Robinson	Thompson
Dillingham	La Follette	Shafroth	Thornton
Fletcher	Lane	Sheppard	Walsh
Gallinger	McCumber	Sherman	Warren
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	White
Hardwick	Norris	Smith, Md.	Williams
Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Smith, S. C.	Works
Hollis	Overman	Smoot	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence, on account of sickness, of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. I should have made this announcement two or three days ago, but neglected to do so. He will be detained for the balance of the week. This announcement may stand for that time.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is absent on business of the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I make the same announcement with reference to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. He is absent on official business. I am also requested to state that a pair exists between the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. As to how they will vote on this question I have no knowledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

The motion pending before the Senate is to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 6, line 17, was adopted. The amendment inserted the words "mental or manual," in line 17, and the motion is to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that in place of the vote by which the amendment was accepted that particular amendment may be passed over. I suppose I will have to have unanimous consent for that.

Mr. REED. Then it would be necessary to reconsider the vote, letting the bill stand without the amendment being acted upon, and then you would have it re-referred to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. REED. If the chairman makes that request, I think it should be taken by viva voce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks that the vote by which the words "mental or manual" were inserted may be reconsidered. Is there any objection to that? The Chair hears none, so that vote is reconsidered. What is the further request of the Senator?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That that amendment may be passed over for the time being, temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina also asks that the amendment may be passed over for the time being. The Chair hears no objection.

The next amendment before the Senate is on page 9, the amendment being to strike out the following words, in lines 4, 5, and 6:

No two aliens coming in the same vessel or other vehicle of carriage or transportation shall be tested with the same slip.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Immigration was, on page 9, line 23, after the word "of," to insert "or legally charged with," so as to read:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of or legally charged with an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in view of the action of the Senate in striking out the words "legally charged with" in the preceding section, these words ought to go out now.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; that would naturally follow. They would be meaningless.

Mr. REED. Then, as I understand, they are withdrawn by the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. If the Senate votes "no," the amendment will go out.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 15, after the word "case," to strike out:

But such determination shall not become final until a period of 30 days has elapsed. Within 3 days after such determination the Secretary of Labor shall cause to be published a brief statement reciting the substance of the application, the facts presented at the hearing and his determination thereon, in 3 daily newspapers of general circulation in three of the principal cities of the United States. At any time during said period of 30 days any person dissatisfied with the ruling may appeal to the district court of the United States of the district into which the labor is sought to be brought, which court or the judge thereof in vacation shall have jurisdiction to try de novo such question of necessity, and the decision in such court shall be final. Such appeal shall operate as a supersedeas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what is the purpose in striking out that provision?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The department complains of the delay and the expense incident to carrying into court these questions that are largely administrative. The committee thought the department had ample facilities for determining such matters, and they simply struck out that long and cumbersome part that has embarrassed them very greatly in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment just read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 9, after the word "servants," to insert "accompanying their employer," so as to read:

Provided further, That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants accompanying their employer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 21, after the word "Zone," to insert:

Provided further, That aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens and aliens returning after temporary absence to an unrelinquished United States domicile may be admitted in the discretion

of the Secretary of Labor, and under such conditions as he may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 18, after the word "guests," to strike out:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall exclude the wife or minor children of a citizen of the United States.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina if the matter referred to in lines 18, 19, and 20, on page 12, is covered by any other provision of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think it is covered. This provision relates to cases where aliens have come into this country and have declared their intention to become citizens and then have gone out of the country and subsequently have returned to it. Under the general provisions of the bill, without this provision, they would have to go through the same process as any other immigrants.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The House bill on the lines indicated provided:

That nothing in this act—

It did not refer to this particular section—

shall exclude the wife or minor children of a citizen of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Oh, the Senator is referring to that amendment?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Yes; that is the one we are now considering. The committee, of course, has advised that this provision should be eliminated. I believe it contains a very good policy, and I desire to know whether the same principle is covered by any other section of the bill. If it is not covered by something elsewhere in the bill, I think the House provision should be retained, because it is unthinkable that an alien citizen or a native citizen could have his wife or his minor children excluded from coming to this country because they did not meet the educational or some other test prescribed in this bill. In a word, can the Senator state why this provision was stricken out?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator will turn to section 22, on page 47, he will find it says:

That whenever an alien shall have been naturalized or shall have taken up his permanent residence in this country and shall have filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen, and thereafter shall send for his wife or minor children to join him, and said wife or any of said minor children shall be found to be affected with any contagious disorder, such wife or minor children shall be held, under such regulations as the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe, until it shall be determined whether the disorder will be easily curable or whether they can be permitted to land without danger to other persons; and they shall not be either admitted or deported until such facts have been ascertained; and if it shall be determined—

And so forth. That is a provision whereby these persons with contagious diseases which would ordinarily cause their exclusion are to be detained until it is found whether they can be admitted without jeopardizing the lives and health of the citizens of this country.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Assuming that there are other provisions in the bill covering the part stricken out, I withdraw my opposition for the present.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That was the reason for it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very much afraid there is no provision covering this proposition. Let us go back for a moment to page 7. Among those excluded are—

All children under 16 years of age, unaccompanied by or not coming to one or both of their parents.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator will turn to page 48 he will see that that is amply covered.

Mr. REED. I am coming to that very matter.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Look at the provision on page 48.

Mr. REED. The language stricken out is:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall exclude the wife or minor children of a citizen of the United States.

Now, we have an exclusion of all children under 16 years of age unless they are coming to their parents. Nothing is said there about the wife. Then we go to page 48.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Read the proviso there in italics.

Mr. REED (reading):

That whenever an alien shall have been naturalized or shall have taken up his permanent residence in this country and shall have filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen and thereafter shall send for his wife or minor children to join him and said wife or any of said minor children shall be found to be affected with any contagious disorder—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Now read the proviso on that same page.

Mr. REED. Page 48?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes. [Reading:]

Provided, That if the person sending for wife or minor children is naturalized a wife to whom married or a minor child born subsequent to such husband's or father's naturalization shall be admitted without detention.

Mr. REED. That applies only to the naturalized citizen. It does not apply, and I call the Senator's attention to that fact, to the man who has applied for naturalization. That clause does not apply to the man who is permanently a resident here and who possibly is ineligible for naturalization. Certain classes of people are ineligible. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that it is a question worthy of consideration whether there may not be now a class of people not naturalized, who either have applied for naturalization or who for some reason are ineligible, who could not bring their wives and children here.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Missouri would not want one who could not become a citizen of this country to send for his wife and children and have them come into this country without the provisions in this section, which simply mean that they must be detained. Even here in the first section—

Mr. REED. The Senator means on account of health, or something of that kind?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes. The bill says now, in section 22, that whenever an alien shall have been naturalized or shall have taken up his residence in this country and shall have filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen, then, if his wife and children come here, they must be detained to see whether or not they will spread disease. In this proviso, when the man has become naturalized, his wife and children are admitted.

Mr. REED. I do not desire to detain the Senate, but I am very fearful that an injustice might be worked there. As the section will come up again in some other form, however, for the present I shall make no further objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 4, after the word "solicit," to insert "or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit," so as to read:

That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation or in any way to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit, or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit the importation or migration of any contract laborer or contract laborers into the United States, unless such contract laborer or contract laborers are exempted under the provisions of section 3 of this act.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill why that amendment is necessary. It seems to me the language preceding it is sufficient.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. To what language does the Senator refer?

Mr. WARREN. The language which the Secretary has just read, and which I believe is in lines 4 and 5, page 14.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. "Or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit?"

Mr. WARREN. It reads here:

That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation or in any way to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit—

Then follows—

or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit.

I see no necessity for that last clause. Perhaps the Senator has some reason for it. The Senator will notice that the language preceding that is:

Or in any way to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit.

I speak of it now because the same amendment occurs in several places on the following pages.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the idea of the committee in incorporating that amendment, as well as I recall now, was that very often attempts were made, and without this language it would be necessary to prove that the person actually did induce and bring in an alien when there might be evidence that there was an attempt made, even if there was no result found. It was inserted to shut off the possibility of their coming in even where at the time there was a failure of inducements which might ultimately bear fruit, as well as I recall.

Mr. WARREN. If there have been such cases as that, that may explain it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The commissioner called our attention to that fact.

Mr. WARREN. I may not give enough credit to the English language, but it seems to me, when it reads as it does here as it came from the House, that it is unlawful to in any way induce, assist, encourage, or solicit the immigration of contract

laborers, that covers the matter fully. I have examined the dictionary, and I do not see how anything further would be necessary to make that effective. It seems to me that this language, "or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit," is surplusage, unless it is sought to make this legislation so drastic that if an American walking along the street in a foreign country should say in response to a question that his country was a good one he might be indicted for an attempt to encourage emigration to this country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As well as I recall, cases have arisen where there has been an attempt and nothing has come of it, but later on that very attempt has borne fruit and lawsuits have grown out of it, even though there was an immediate failure. If you look at the next section you will find this language:

That any person, including the master, agent, owner, or consignee of any vessel, who shall bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise, or shall attempt, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise,

The advertisement of a steamship company is an attempt to induce by promise or reward, and, as well as I remember, that was put in to discourage that particular kind of advertisement by certain corporations, that labor here was desirable and could be employed at certain wages. They did not bring them in right then, but they were making the attempt to induce them to come.

Mr. WARREN. There may be places where the amendment would seem necessary, but in the place I speak of and on page 15, line 5—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think that was made to conform to the section following, so as to make it conform in both instances where it applied to the same thing.

Mr. WARREN. I am sure the Senator thinks it is necessary, but I do not see the necessity of it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that this matter was discussed before the committee, and that I called attention to it as being a very dangerous provision. The Commissioner of Immigration was present at the time. While I am not at liberty to quote him here, nor shall I quote him, I make the statement that there is no need of this provision in the bill.

The chairman will also remember that I called attention to the fact that a certain farmer in my State had written a letter to certain men across the border in the Dominion of Canada, when he had evidently received an inquiry or a letter asking him if work was to be had in the harvest field, having answered the letter and said that they could get labor at \$3.50 a day. All this particular farmer did was to answer that letter. Later on, in the fall, an immigration agent took the case up, and that particular farmer was fined \$5,000. The case has been in court. I can not recall the case just now, but it is a matter of record that for the simple offense of this farmer writing a letter and answering an inquiry as to whether labor could be had he was subjected to a fine. Whether he was imprisoned or not I do not know; but he was subject to imprisonment, and I do know that a fine was imposed.

I am opposed to this amendment. It is unnecessary, and I do not believe that the commissioner will insist upon this amendment.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from North Dakota has well stated what I feared. In these days of neutrality under our restrictions, which we are striving to obey, we are giving particular attention to what might be the construction of our language, and it seems to me if I should be asked a question upon the streets of a foreign country or if I should answer a letter truthfully that I thought this a good country, or a good country for a laboring man, under this language I might be apprehended.

I do not feel that it is necessary, because while we want to have all due restrictions, it does not seem to me that we ought to make a law that looks as if we had an attack of hysteria at the time we enacted it and were afraid that anybody should feel that we have a country worthy of receiving respectable immigrants or a country desirable to live in.

The language is strong enough without it, and the presumption is that if it is added it must be for a restriction which I do not believe we should be submitted to. I do not believe the Senator or I should be placed where if we received a respectful letter of inquiry we could not properly answer it or that we could not answer a respectable inquiry upon a street of any city of our country or any other. I know I often receive letters from abroad from people I have met asking questions about our country, its progress, its prosperity, its plans, and so forth, and I am in the habit of answering them freely, with no thought

of encouraging a man to come here in the light of bringing him against our labor-contract laws or anything of that kind.

I want to see the law restrictive. I want to see the law a reasonable one; but that kind of language interpolated into it, where it is totally unnecessary, ought to be stricken out.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Wyoming can see that in the case indicated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] this language would save the farmer from that humiliation and embarrassment if he had just written a letter. Though he did break the contract law by saying that labor could be obtained at three dollars and a half a day, this says, "to induce, assist, encourage or solicit, or attempt to induce labor to come."

Mr. WARREN. Right there will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Then we take the ground that we want to pass a law whereby we deny ourselves the right to say to any inquiring party what we think of the country, its prosperity, or its opportunities. Is that in the Senator's mind?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; the Senator will recognize that he would have the right not only to state as an individual in a foreign country or elsewhere that this is a fine field for labor but the wages paid in different occupations. However, that is quite different from me, a farmer, writing to laborers in another country—contract labor—that they could get three dollars and a half a day here. That is a different proposition from saying that the wages are high.

Mr. WARREN. That is a long way from contracting with a man to come here and work at lower wages than are paid in this country. The Senator knows what the law attempts to effect and what we all sustain it in, to prevent the making of contracts abroad with laborers and to bring them in to compete with our own at lower prices. On the other hand, this country has been built up very largely by a class of immigrants who have done credit to themselves and to the country, and foreigners should be able to obtain some direct information of this kind. They get some through the press and in other ways. It may so happen that the Senator or I or other Senators have met and will continue to meet persons abroad who make inquiries regarding this country. Shall we stultify ourselves and belittle the country by not answering frankly what the prospects are in this country?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Oh, this proposed law does not even intimate anything of the kind. It expressly says who shall "attempt to induce." What the Senator refers to is no attempt on his part to induce labor to come at a specified price. You do not call on them to come under contract. The object is to avoid the very difficulty that the farmer in the State of North Dakota allowed himself to get into.

Mr. WARREN. Then, as I understand the Senator, the object is to avoid that by putting a ban upon and muzzling everyone in this country so that our people will not be able to answer a letter of inquiry as to the wages of the country.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Surely not. No such construction can be placed on it. If the man makes an attempt, or if he invites specifically, as anyone would construe the law, a contract laborer to come here at a specified price, he is breaking the law.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from California will allow me just a word further, that is amply provided for in the language which precedes this proposed amendment. The whole meaning is to induce, to assist, to encourage, or to solicit. It is to favor or to help in some way, not to "attempt to encourage," carrying it to a degree that I do not understand. It may be that the English language is further away from me to-day than usual.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I only want to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that I think he is giving this clause in the bill altogether too broad a construction. It does not forbid soliciting or attempting to induce laborers to come to this country, but contract laborers. I do not very well see how a conviction could have been had against the farmer mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA]. Certainly there was no attempt in that case to bring in contract labor as I understand from what the Senator said about it, and I do not see very well how he was convicted under those circumstances.

Mr. WARREN. It is easier to convict him under the language of this bill than it would be probably without it.

Mr. WORKS. No; I think not.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from California to the fact that all that the farmer did was

to write the letter, but he did employ the five men in the harvest field. They were employed by him later on. He entered into no contract with them except writing a letter, telling them that work was to be had.

Mr. WORKS. That would be no violation of the statute unless there was a contract in advance and he brought them in under the contract, for that is what contract labor means.

Mr. GRONNA. Then I ask the Senator if the law is rigid now, why make it still more rigid?

Mr. WORKS. I do not very well see how anyone could be convicted under those circumstances. I think there must have been some mistake about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the general purposes of this act, but, like most laws, it goes a little bit too far, because when men undertake to do anything—get to the point of doing it—they go further than they ought. Some time ago one of the sweetest and best informed women in the State of Mississippi came to me and said that she had received an invitation to deliver certain lectures somewhere in Great Britain—principally Scotland, I believe—and she wanted to select as the subject of her lectures Dixieland—her own country. She came to me to learn to what extent she could go in telling what a real good land Dixie is, how much hog and hominy might be had in it, how pleasant the fields are, how happy the climate, how fertile the soil, and all the balance of it. She had, much to her own astonishment and mine, stumbled over certain provisions of the immigration law which prevented her at that time—I did not know what were the particular provisions, but I expect it was this language:

That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepare the transportation or in any way to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit.

The balance of it might stand very well without the word "encourage," and I do not see how it could have been with that alone very wrong. Then this committee has put in "or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit."

I have no objection to making a law against those who induce or assist or solicit or attempt to induce, assist, or solicit, but when you come to saying that a man has committed a crime who has encouraged immigration to the United States, that is going too far. It seems to me if you happened to meet a man under a shelter in the rain in the city of London and fell into conversation with him and told him what a good country you had, and what a good State, and what was the prevailing rate of wages, and if that man might form an acquaintance with you and afterwards come to the United States and hire himself to you, you would be guilty under this act of "encouraging" immigration. Then if you go further and say he shall be guilty of crime if he "attempts to encourage," I do not know how they would proceed against you, because the fault would have taken place on English soil in that particular case, and, of course, they could not lay the venue. But suppose the encouragement had taken place by letter in the manner indicated by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. Some man over there writes to me, saying "What sort of a country have you got down in Mississippi now? What sort of encouragement is there for a farm laborer? What sort of encouragement is there for labor in the mines, or anything of that sort?" Suppose I would write back to him a general letter; tell him what a glorious country it is, what a sweet place it is to live in, how you call yourself blessed every morning whether you looked over the front porch of a mansion or the back porch of a cabin, blessed simply because you are in such a happy land under such happy skies, and then suppose you told him what sheep sold for and how much was paid for labor, and all that. Then suppose this man would come over afterwards. In that case I would not have been guilty of "inducing" or "assisting" or "soliciting," but I would have been guilty under this act of "encouraging" that man's moving into the United States, and, as far as I can see, encouraging him regardless of the fact whether he came to me afterwards and got employment from me or whether he came to that particular section and county and got it from somebody else. If after writing him that sort of a letter he came to me, when I had written to him that he could get so much per month or so much per day, a cabin, and so much garden room, and free wood, and free pasturage for work stock and milch cows, and a half holiday, and whatever the other things were that I might in truth have said to him about the country, and he said, "I got your letter and I have come over here, and I want you to make good"; I would feel pretty much like a whipped dog if I could not do it. I would feel like I was acting in bad faith.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to recall to the Senator from Mississippi that most of this language is placed here on account of the fact that the steamship companies en-

courage immigrants in order to fill up their steerage and cabin space.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is all very well to hit them, because they are "inducing" and are in that way "assisting." They are "soliciting" people to come here, and they are doing it for selfish pocketbook purposes. But while you are doing that, it does not seem to me that you ought to adopt language which is so broad as to include other people, and to include people who have no idea of doing any unlawful act at all, and who are merely speaking well of themselves and their neighbors and their country.

I shall move, Mr. President, to strike out the word "encourage" in line 4 and the word "encourage" in line 5, so that it shall read "induce, assist, or solicit, or attempt to induce, assist, or solicit."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suppose the Senator from Mississippi knows that the word "encourage" in the roman text is already in the law of 1907. It is a part of the old law, and that has not been changed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that; and all you have done is to add the words "or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You have gone further, and I am opposed to the old law in that particular, to going further back, and I am opposed to both of them for the very reason I was stating. Here is this woman who made a good record, a very intelligent woman, a lecturer, who wanted to prepare a lecture upon Dixie, the land she lived in and the land she loved, and meant thereby to tell the English and Scottish people about Dixie; and she found out that she was about to stumble into a violation of the immigration laws of the United States for doing what? By going to Scotland and telling what a great country of undeveloped and sublime resources Dixie is. I do not think we ought to have any such law capable of such construction as that upon the statute books. The language now upon the statute books makes it a crime to "encourage," and the language proposed adds to it "to attempt to encourage." I move to strike out the word "encourage" in both places.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Mississippi will withhold his motion, I will ask that the amendment be passed over because we are now considering the committee amendments. All that we could do now would be to strike out the word "encourage" in the committee amendment, because we can not strike out the word "encourage" in the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to do that. At the proper time I will make that motion.

Mr. REED. Of course, if the language the Senator from Mississippi objected to is given serious consideration, then this particular amendment ought now to be made to conform.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The chairman of the committee has asked that the matter should go over until we reach the parliamentary stage where individual amendments will be in order. He has asked that the entire matter might go over. I ask that my amendment may go over with it, and another in line 5, on page 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be passed over.

Mr. WARREN. I understand the proposition is to pass over the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. To pass over all.

Mr. WARREN. To pass it over and to leave the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi in abeyance?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; in abeyance.

Mr. WARREN. I am assuming that we also have passed over the amendment on line 5 on page 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands.

Mr. WALSH. What was done with the amendment proposed in lines 8, 9, and 10 on page 14?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nothing. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "act," in section 5, page 14, line 8, insert:

And have been imported with the permission of the Secretary of Labor in accordance with said section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. I desire before it is disposed of to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether the word "and" should not be "or." It is very proper to make it criminal to induce, assist, or solicit any of those not within the exceptions in section 3.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that the amendment be temporarily passed over and I will make a note of the Senator's suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to section 5 beginning in line 8 on page 14 and the amendment to section 6 on page 15 are passed over.

The next amendment of the Committee on Immigration was, in section 7, page 15, line 20, after the word "printing," to strike out "or"; in line 21, after the word "representation," to strike out "or by the"; in line 21, after the word "commissions," to strike out the words "or the"; in line 22, after the word "alien," to insert "or otherwise"; and in the same line, after the word "otherwise," to strike out "or by any transportation company to another transportation company participating in the transportation of any alien out of the fare of such alien."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 16, line 1, after the word "encourage," to insert "or attempt to solicit, invite, or encourage."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that this amendment be passed over for the reason I gave a while ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; it applies only to persons engaged in the business of transporting. I am perfectly willing to punish them for encouraging it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Very well; let the amendment be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 16, line 14, after the word "vessel," to insert "thus proceeded against," so as to read:

And no vessel thus proceeded against shall be granted clearance pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such fine, or while the fine imposed remains unpaid, nor shall such fine be remitted or refunded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 18, after the words "United States," to insert "either from a foreign country or any insular possession of the United States"; in line 7, after the word "imbecility," to insert "feeble-mindedness"; and in the same line, after the word "epilepsy," to insert "constitutional psychopathic inferiority, chronic alcoholism," so as to read:

Sec. 9. That it shall be unlawful for any person, including any transportation company other than railway lines entering the United States from foreign contiguous territory, or the owner, master, agent, or consignee of any vessel, to bring to the United States, either from a foreign country or any insular possession of the United States, any alien afflicted with idiocy, insanity, imbecility, feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, constitutional psychopathic inferiority, chronic alcoholism, tuberculosis in any form, or a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, etc.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I raised the question a little while ago as to that term "constitutional psychopathic inferiority." I still think it is a very awkward phrase, but I have been told that some very distinguished alienists have recommended it as a proper term to be used in this bill, and that being the fact I have no disposition to contest it at all. I think the amendment might well be agreed to. I feel sure that some other phrase would have been better had those distinguished gentlemen taken time to consider the matter carefully, but this term doubtless will accomplish their purpose. The idea is that if they find a man mentally deficient, not stating to what extent he shall be deficient, he will be excluded. The term "inferiority" is very elastic and will enable them, I think, to exclude a good many men who are merely erratic rather than mentally unsound. However, as some distinguished philosopher said, we are all crazy; it is a mere matter of degree, perhaps it is well to submit the matter to these distinguished alienists for determination.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is about 4 o'clock and, if agreeable to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, I wish to move an executive session.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside before going into executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then, if there is no objection, the pending amendment will first be agreed to, and then the bill will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. GALLINGER. That having been agreed to, I ask the chairman if it would not be well to recur to the same phraseology that previously occurs in the bill and agree to that amendment also.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. All right.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that ought to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment on page 4, line 25, will be agreed to. It is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 57 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 11, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 10, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Come, Thou almighty God, with all Thy quickening power and possess our hearts that we may think wisely, act nobly our part in the great drama of life, for we realize that if we do faithfully the things of to-day we shall be the better prepared to do with greater ease and efficiency the things of to-morrow, and when the crucial test shall come, and come it will, we shall have builded a character which shall enable us to acquit ourselves like men and leave behind us a record worthy of emulation and be prepared for whatever awaits us in the great beyond. And Thine shall be the praise forever. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WALLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a report made by the American Chemical Society relative to the feasibility of extending the chemical and dyestuff industry in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a report made by the American Chemical Society as to the feasibility of extending the manufacture of dyestuffs, and so forth. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. What is the request?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will restate what it is so that the gentleman from Illinois will understand.

Mr. WALLIN. It is the report made by the American Chemical Society relative to the feasibility of extending the industry of chemicals and dyestuffs in the United States. There is no politics in it at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of December 8.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal, which appeared on December 8, written by "Marse Henry" Watterson.

Mr. MANN. In relation to what?

Mr. HOWARD. In relation to the military situation in the United States.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HABIT-FORMING DRUGS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration conference report on the bill (H. R. 6282) to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6282, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. It fully explains the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (No. 1196).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who

produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "October," inserted by said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the word "March"; and on page 1 of the bill, line 4, strike out the word "fourteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "obliged" in the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "required"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or distributed, showing the amount dispensed or distributed, the date, and the name and address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed, except such as may be dispensed or distributed to a patient upon whom such physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of two years from the date of dispensing or distributing such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "States," insert the following: "to any person in any foreign country"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "territorial," insert a comma; and in line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "Navy" and the comma, insert the following: "the Public Health Service" and a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 15 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "interest" and insert in lieu thereof the word "intent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "veterinarian," insert the following: "required to register under the terms of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "one-fourth" and insert in lieu thereof "one-eighth"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLAUDE KITCHIN,
CORDELL HULL,
J. HAMPTON MOORE,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. M. SIMMONS,
JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
C. S. THOMAS,
P. J. MCCUMBER,
REED SMOOT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture,

compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment provides for the date of effectiveness of this act, and the House recedes with an amendment fixing March 1, 1915, as the date the act shall go into effect in lieu of October 1, 1914. This change in date is necessary, for before the act can take effect provision must be made for registering and issuing official order blanks to at least 250,000 manufacturers, dealers, physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment permits officers of the United States, the States, the Territories, the insular possessions, and the District of Columbia lawfully engaged in making purchases of the specified habit-forming drugs to do so without registering and without paying the special tax, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The act requires the registration of every person producing, manufacturing, selling, giving away, or dispensing any of these specified habit-forming drugs, and then excepts certain officers of the Federal and State Governments. This amendment therefore becomes necessary in order to obviate any question of the right of these officers to dispense or give away the drugs which they purchase without registering, and the House recedes with an amendment, changing the word "obliged" to "required."

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, and 35 are either changes in language making the phraseology of the act more clear and certain or correcting clerical errors, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment as redrafted does not require the personal attention of a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon to dispense or distribute any of the aforesaid narcotics, but, in case there is not personal attention on the part of the physician, dentist, or veterinarian, a record showing the amount of the drug dispensed or distributed, the date, the name, and the address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed must be kept for a period of two years, subject to inspection by the officers, agents, and employees of the Treasury Department and to the State, Territorial, District, municipal, and insular officials named in this act. Physicians, dentists, and veterinary surgeons will not have to keep a record of the quantity of the drug administered, etc., when in personal attendance upon their patients.

Amendment No. 10: Section 8 of this bill makes it unlawful for any person not registered under the provisions of this act to have in his possession or under his control any of the habit-forming drugs specified in this act, but exempts employees of registered persons acting in the scope of their employment and nurses acting under the supervision of a physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon. As nurses are often employed by the patient, in order to prevent a nurse employed by a patient having possession of the aforementioned drugs from becoming liable to the penalty for violation of this act it therefore is necessary for the physician, dentist, or veterinary surgeon to register under this act, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15: This amendment is to make it clear that it will be lawful for manufacturers and dealers to sell to the specified public officers without the official order blank. This amendment becomes necessary because previous amendments have exempted these officers from the necessity of registering and obtaining official order blanks. The House recedes with an amendment specifying among the exempted class of officers those of the Public Health Service.

Amendment No. 17: This amendment becomes necessary because in the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and the Canal Zone the United States internal-revenue laws do not apply and there are no Federal internal-revenue districts or collectors. Neither are there any United States district courts in the Philippines. This amendment merely bestows jurisdiction in the Philippine Islands on the local courts and gives the President authority to issue such Executive orders as are deemed necessary to carry into effect the intent and purpose of this act, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: This amendment merely extends the exemption from liability under this act to persons delivering any of the aforementioned drugs prescribed or dispensed by a physician, dentist, or veterinarian, and to United States, county, municipal, District, Territorial, or insular officers or officials acting within the scope of their official duties, and the House recedes with an amendment requiring the physician, dentist, or veterinarian to register under the terms of this act.

Amendment No. 29: The House bill limited the amount of heroin that could be sold, distributed, given away, or dispensed

without coming within the terms of this act to one-twelfth of a grain. The Senate increased the amount to one-fourth of a grain, and the House recedes with an amendment limiting the amount to one-eighth of a grain.

Amendment No. 32: This amendment exempts nurses working under the supervision of physicians, dentists, or veterinary surgeons registered under the act from the provisions of the act. This provision becomes necessary because the nurse is generally employed by the patient, and is therefore not an employee of a person registered under the act, and the House recedes.

CLAUDE KITCHIN,
CORDELL HULL,
J. HAMPTON MOORE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. I notice the conference report places the date for putting this act into effect as March 15. While doubtless that was a proper date at the time the report was agreed to in conference, it seems rather short now. I realize that it can not be very well changed now before it is agreed to, but I suggest to the gentleman to take into consideration the question of having a joint resolution passed fixing the date a little further in the future. This act affects so many people that I doubt very much whether it can be properly known and understood throughout the country by March 15.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think what the gentleman says is true, and we will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. KITCHIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19422, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19422, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19422, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19422) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] use some time now?

Mr. DAVIS. I will. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. [Applause.]

OUR INADEQUATE NATIONAL DEFENSES.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, on the 15th day of November, about four weeks ago, Maj. Gen. William W. Wotherspoon, Chief of Staff and virtual head of the United States Army, made his report to Congress. Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. HAY, of Virginia, said, in pleasantry, I hope, that Gen. Wotherspoon's report must have been written when he was "nervous and excited." The expression sounds strangely familiar. That report of Gen. Wotherspoon showed that the United States is totally and absolutely unprepared for war. Chairman HAY, of Virginia, I ask you why, instead of declaring your hearings closed, you do not summon the man who wrote that report? I challenge you to summon before your committee Maj. Gen. Wotherspoon, head of the United States Army, and his predecessor, Gen. Leonard Wood. Will you do it?

Mr. HAY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. HAY. I will say to the gentleman that Maj. Gen. Wotherspoon is now on the retired list of the Army.

Mr. GARDNER. Maj. Gen. Wotherspoon has been for a few days on the retired list. You summoned his successor. Why do you not summon the man who wrote the report?

Mr. HAY. Because it has never been the habit or custom to summon a man who is no longer holding the office.

Mr. GARDNER. I challenge you to summon the man who wrote that report, and I challenge you to summon Maj. Gen. Wood, his predecessor. Will you do it?

Mr. HAY. I will do it if I think it is necessary, and I will not if I do not.

Mr. GARDNER. I sat at the feet of Gamaliel the day before yesterday while he discoursed on our present capacity to defend ourselves against a foreign enemy. I listened with delight to the President's dissertation on the glories of friendship, "service," and concord. How admirably he expresses those glorious truths which, so far as I know, nobody disputes! However, it is not the manner of the President's discourse, but rather its matter, which should awaken our interest. It is not to the generalities which he so brilliantly expresses, but rather to his bill of particulars that I invite your attention. It is the meat inside of the coconut which is of importance, not the shell on the outside, no matter how beautifully it may be adorned.

THE PRESIDENT'S MAN OF STRAW.

Let us see how the President states the position of those of us who differ from his views. Let me restate the wonderful dreams in which the President thinks that we indulge. Let me reconstruct the fantastic man of straw which the President erected and then proceeded to demolish with the shrapnel of his scholarly eloquence.

We will not—

Says the President—

ask our young men to spend the best years of their lives making soldiers of themselves.

Who, pray, says the contrary? Surely not I. Far from dreaming of such a thing, I am proposing a thorough investigation by an independent commission which shall recommend to the people of the United States exactly what course we ought to pursue to insure our national security. Surely it is not such "nervous and excited" persons as ex-Secretary Meyer, ex-Secretary Dickinson, ex-Secretary Bonaparte, ex-Secretary Wright, and ex-Secretary Stimson who are advocating compulsory military service. All five of those gentlemen have signified their intention to address the Committee on Rules in favor of an immediate and thorough investigation of this whole question. Four of those former Secretaries have made the strongest possible public utterances, and in not one of those utterances is there breathed one single word about compulsory military service.

My friends, I can recall only one recent public speech which deals either directly or by suggestion or by inference with compulsory military service. That address was delivered by the present Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, at a meeting of the National Civic Federation in New York. Mr. Roosevelt advised the American people to look carefully into the system of compulsory military training which the labor party in Australia has ordained for all Australians. So far as I know that is the only public word on the subject which has been reported.

The President, of course, has the power to discipline Assistant Secretary Roosevelt for his temerity, if he will, but he ought not to rely on his own subordinate's words for material with which to stuff his man of straw. Ah, Mr. President, it did not need the battery of your exquisite English to destroy your own fantastic bogie man of straw. He was but the figment, the pleasant figment, of your resourceful brain. One whiff of the healthy fresh air of reality would have dissolved him as a mist is dissolved before the sun. But the public would have been a loser, for your bogie man, sir, is the very acme of the fancy of the cloistered scholar, and woe betide the common mortal who seeks to impair his gossamer fabric with wanton touch.

THE PLUCK OF GARRISON AND FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT.

Right here let me digress a moment to take off my hat to the superb courage of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt. He has taken this occasion, despite the administration, to tell the country that our modest Navy is already 18,000 men short, and that there are more deficiencies to follow when the vessels which are now under construction are completed. Roosevelt's pluck is equaled, but not surpassed, by that of Secretary Garrison, who this very day, in the teeth of the President's message, has recommended an increase of 25,000 men and 1,000 officers for the United States Army. In his report he tells us how a bill should be drawn to provide this increase. So I take occasion at this moment to introduce the bill which you see in my hand, in order to put his recommendation into effect.

Mr. GORDON. Would you desire to have that bill referred to a special committee also?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; everything to a special commission, but it looks as if we could not have one.

TRAINED CITIZENRY.

"We must depend in every time of national peril"—listen, gentlemen, because I am reading your President's words—"we must depend in every time of national peril on citizenry trained and accustomed to arms," says the President. No one would venture to contradict that admirably stated truism, but how are we to get enough citizenry, as he calls us ordinary people? How are we to find all the men necessary for that arduous training in times of peace? How great an army of Regulars do we need to defend this country during the long months while that citizenry is being mobilized? All of this requires investigation, and especially impartial investigation.

In the very near future we shall have only 25,000 regular soldiers available for the far-flung battle line of our field army. That is what your Secretary of War says in his report published to-day, and he points out that the police force of New York City is about half as numerous as the Nation's Army.

Does the President realize that there are only 120,000 militiamen in this whole Nation, in spite of all the efforts which the States and the United States have made to encourage our citizen soldiery? Does he realize that of that unpretentious number 23,000 did not show up for inspection last year? Does he know that 31,000 did not appear at the annual encampment? Is he aware of the fact that 44,000, or 40 per cent of all the militiamen who are armed with a rifle, did not even appear on the rifle range? Yet all these facts are contained in the report of the Chief of Staff, and similar amazing statements appeared in the reports of his predecessor. Is not the remedy worthy of the study of men whose minds are not already made up?

There is just one way to get men to buckle down to the hard work necessary to become trained militiamen, and that is by paying them.

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Providing the gentleman does not get "nervous and excited."

Mr. BLACKMON. I never do that. How long has the gentleman from Massachusetts been in Congress?

Mr. GARDNER. Twelve years.

Mr. BLACKMON. And the gentleman has just now discovered the inadequate preparation that the Congress of the United States has been making for the Army and Navy?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Alabama had done me the honor to read the speeches I have been making, he would know that I have confessed that I have sat like a coward for 12 years in silence because I was afraid to tell the 700 men in the National Guard in my district that I did not think they were an adequate protection.

Mr. BLACKMON. That was while the gentleman's party was in power?

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, both parties are at fault. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, you have got to pay men if you want them to work. Does that plan appeal to the President? It certainly appeals to me, and I voted that way when the militia pay bill was up. I believe in paying the militia, but I am by no means sure that the payment of money will be sufficient of itself to attract the necessary numbers.

Just remember that all over this country amusements are at the elbow of every young man to-day as they never were before. Remember also that the income of the Carnegie Peace Endowment is some \$480,000 a year—a very little less than half a million dollars spread broadcast to pay for the activity of the organizer, for the pen of the ready writer, and for the tongue of the lyceum circuiter. Why, with half of that sum expended in printer's ink you could get up a revolution in many of the nations of this hemisphere.

But where is this trained citizenry to get the weapons of war? According to the last report of the Chief of Staff we are short 316 field guns and 1,322,384 rounds of ammunition necessary to equip our militia in time of war.

Last year Gen. Wood asked for enough guns and ammunition to bring the United States up to the standard of Bulgaria. That immodest demand was gently but firmly rejected. Even the President, with his transcendental ideas, can not expect his trained citizenry to fight with their fists. It may be true that throughout our history we have depended on our trained or untrained civilians, but surely the President would expect our troops to go into battle equipped with some weapon more deadly than an historic parallel. I will not say that we have not enough field artillery ammunition to last during one single day's battle if all our guns were engaged, but I will say that an officer very high up in the United States Army has told me so.

I do not, however, hesitate to assert that if war were to break out to-day, it would be found that our coast defenses have not sufficient ammunition for an hour's fight. The report of the Chief of Staff—Gen. Wotherspoon—confirmed, I am told,

by his successor, shows that for coast-defense mortars we have ammunition enough to last for one-half hour, and for coast-defense guns we have ammunition enough to last three quarters of an hour.

THE NAVY.

After all, as the President says, we must depend on our Navy. But have we an adequate Navy? I should rather give heed to the opinion of the General Naval Board on that subject, expressed year after year, than to listen to the gossip which trickles out from behind the fast-closed doors of the Naval Committee. As you know, gentlemen, except yesterday, all hearings of the Naval Committee have been private, with no reporters present. How do you expect that the public is going to get any reports of the proceedings except those colored by the views of the committeemen who give the information to the reporters?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the gentleman leaves the Army part of it, I take it the gentleman is in favor of building up a larger standing army.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, indeed; I am in favor of 25,000 additional men for the mobile army, as recommended by your Secretary of War. Furthermore, I am in favor of enlisting as soon as may be 11,000 men for our coast defense, inasmuch as the report of Gen. Weaver, Chief of Coast Artillery, shows that we lack that number of men to man the coast fortresses.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before we can get into a war with a first-class nation the present European war will certainly have to close—

Mr. GARDNER. Why?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment. Why should we build up a great standing army at a time when every other first-class nation is already at war, when every first-class nation is depleting its national and private resources, when it is destroying its trade and commerce, and when it is exerting every effort in the war that it is already engaged in? It will be 20 years before any first-class nation can get ready for another war with a first-class Nation like ours. It takes money and resources to carry on a first-class war. Why, then, should we get hysterical now, and prepare for a war with a bogie man, when we know no other nation can possibly go into war with us in the next 20 or 25 years?

Mr. GARDNER. That is one of the longest questions I ever heard, but if I apprehend it rightly I can answer it in this way: We want to build up our Army and Navy, which can no longer be improvised in a few months as formerly, so as to be ready to defend this Nation. So far as we can see, it is highly unlikely that we shall be involved in this present war, but we must be ready just the same, or we may be attacked or the Monroe doctrine violated at some future time after this war is over. The gentleman is making the same argument that the French Nation made in our Civil War—in fact, that all Europe made, but which France alone had the temerity to put to the test. Like the gentleman from Tennessee, France argued that the North and the South were engaged in a death struggle, that when it was over it would be easy for any foreign nation to have the better of the winner, and so the French established the Emperor Maximilian in Mexico in defiance of our Monroe doctrine. But France found that instead of being weaker at the end of the war the North was stronger; and, my friend, you will probably find that the winner in this European war is a pretty husky citizen when he gets through. What did the North do? What did we do? We just sent down an army, and we lined our men up on the Rio Grande. We stationed our men looking over that river at the Emperor Maximilian and the French army, and every enlisted man had a copy of the Monroe doctrine in his hand, and out went the French army and down went the Emperor Maximilian. As to a lack of funds for war chests, no nation ever yet was stopped by lack of funds from going to war. We heard that same talk from the pacifists in July last summer. We heard how the bankers would never lend the money for a war, yet the international peace conference at the Lac de Constance a few days later was caught in the vortex of the German mobilization.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly, although I am coming to the gentleman later.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope the gentleman will reach me. The gentleman just a few moments ago stated—

Mr. GARDNER. One moment. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes. Mr. GARDNER. I can only yield for a brief statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This will be brief. The gentleman stated that there was not on hand sufficient ammunition for our coast defenses to fire our guns for half an hour.

Mr. GARDNER. That was not exactly my statement, although approximately so. I did not say "for our coast defenses"; I said, "for our coast-defense mortars," and I said that there was ammunition for three-quarters of an hour for our coast-defense guns.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hold in my hand the report of the Chief of Coast Artillery for 1914, just published.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. On page 16 of the report there is this statement:

Ammunition: The ammunition now on hand and under manufacture is 73 per cent of the allowance fixed by the National Coast Defense Board.

Mr. GARDNER. That is right, but the National Coast Defense Board was entirely wrong. The board fixed the ammunition supply at an amount sufficient for one hour's battle. Seventy-three per cent of an hour is three-quarters of an hour, which conforms with what I have just told you.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If this National Defense Board, which consisted of the best-equipped men in the Army and Navy, are not competent to determine how much ammunition we shall have, who will pay any attention to the conclusions—

Mr. GARDNER. Any independent commission will be competent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Who will pay any attention to the conclusions of the gentleman from Massachusetts as against our experts?

Mr. GARDNER. Now, do not get nervous and excited. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I will not; but the gentleman from Massachusetts is setting himself up as superior in intelligence and judgment to the men who have devoted their lives to the defense of the country.

Mr. GARDNER. And do not make a stump speech in the time allowed me for my address.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. No. I have been pretty patient and have only half an hour left. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana after I get through. I ask the gentleman to wait until the termination of my remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. But I have a resolution here from a butchers' association which I would like to inquire about.

Mr. GARDNER. Very well.

Mr. BARNHART. I hold in my hand a petition which I received this morning—

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Indiana to print that in the RECORD. I decline to yield further.

Mr. BARNHART. But I do not want to print it in the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. Where is this petition from?

Mr. BARNHART. It is from the Butchers' Association of South Bend.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, we are aware of the fact that we are 10 battleships short of safety, because the General Board of the Navy tells us so. We know that we are 49 submarines under the standard. Admiral Badger testified to that fact in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the newspapers managed to find it out. We know that we have no navy in the air at all—only 12 aeroplanes or so, and of those 12 only about 7 can get out of their own way. I think the Army has about the same number. Not one of them is armored, I am told. As to our Navy under the sea, it is extremely scanty for a nation with our far-reaching coast lines, and I believe that a great part of it is antiquated.

As to the condition of our fleet, in default of an investigation I hope the President will give heed to this solemn sentence recorded in the report of the General Board of the Navy.

Mr. MURDOCK. For this year?

Mr. GARDNER. No; the report for this year is not yet out. It will be out next Saturday. This is the last report published. Now listen, gentlemen:

The absence of any definite naval policy on our part, except in the General Board, and the failure of the people, the Congress, and the executive government to recognize the necessity for such a policy has already placed us in a position of inferiority which may lead to war; and this inferiority is progressive and will continue to increase until the necessity for a definite policy is recognized and that policy put into operation.

That report was signed by George Dewey. Now, of course, I suppose that the admiral himself did not pen those words. I do not know who did so, but I say to you, Chairman PADGETT, of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that I challenge you to summon before your committee the man who penned those words.

I challenge you to summon before your committee Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I challenge you to summon before your committee Admiral Willard H. Brownson. I challenge you to summon before your committee Admiral Richard Wainwright. I have sent for the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have notified him twice that I was going to mention his name, and I particularly asked that he should be here. He is not here to answer my question, as was the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. HAY], but I hope he will be here later. If Chairman PADGETT seeks a fair, impartial investigation; if he wishes both sides to be heard; if he desires to open the forum to which the chairman of the Committee on Rules says we must resort, he and you, Mr. Chairman HAY, of Virginia, must summon the witnesses whom I challenge you to summon.

WHEN WILL ALL MEN AGREE?

The President says that naval authorities never agree as to the proper lines on which to develop our Navy. If the expression of that view is designed for an argument, then we should have no Navy whatever until the bright day dawns when all men think alike. Battleships may be out of date, but at all events British battleships have swept the commerce of Germany from the seas while British merchantmen continue to plow the waves in such security that we Americans do not hesitate to intrust them with our precious freight and our still more precious lives. Submarines and mines may have taken the place of battleships, but they have not restored German commerce to the seas and they have not impeded the freedom of British commerce in the Atlantic. In short, then, our officers and officials tell us that we lack men for our Navy, men for our coast defense, and men for our Army; that we lack artillery and that we lack the ammunition with which to charge that artillery; that we lack great battleships to sail the seas and little scouts to act as their messengers and their eyes; that we have a sadly deficient under-sea Navy and practically no overhead fleet at all.

PITILESS PUBLICITY BEHIND CLOSED DOORS.

I have proposed that an independent commission be appointed to investigate all those things, to report to the Congress how the Army and the Navy and the coast defense may be brought up to date and may be made to cooperate with each other; to estimate the men and equipment necessary for our defense, and to report to Congress a definite policy for our future guidance. Instead of approving this commission of inquiry the President of the United States relegates us to the pitiless publicity of hearings behind closed doors. For it is behind closed doors that Chairman PADGETT, of the Committee on Naval Affairs, conducts his hearings; that Chairman SHERLEY, of the committee on fortifications, conducts his hearings; and that Chairman FITZGERALD, who has charge of the defenses of the Panama Canal, conducts his hearings. For the first time since I have been a Member of this House—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman state what he means by "behind closed doors"?

Mr. GARDNER. I mean with no reporters present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that there is a stenographer present.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but he is the committee's stenographer, and there is no news value to the evidence when it is ultimately printed. The gentleman knows that he holds up the record of the evidence until his bills are reported to the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But if the gentleman will permit me, I will state that it is all printed and available.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, yes; long after—

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the gentleman has obtained copies of testimony, and if there is anything that ought to be disclosed why does not he present it?

Mr. HAY. The gentleman from Massachusetts understands that the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs are open not only to the committee stenographers but to newspaper men.

Mr. GARDNER. And I congratulate the gentleman. I did not mention the gentleman's committee when I spoke of committee hearings "behind closed doors." I mentioned the names of the other three chairmen to whom the President has referred this matter for an impartial investigation.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. The gentleman is mistaken in reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs. We had hearings for three days, and all the newspaper people in the country were there.

Mr. GARDNER. I started to tell the House about that a few moments ago, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] interrupted. I think the gentleman from Maryland is

a little mistaken—yesterday for the first time your committee had an open hearing.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. We have them whenever they are demanded.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I started to make this statement—

Mr. GARDNER. I will have to—

Mr. SISSON. That I was in the committee yesterday and to-day and the reporters were in the committee.

Mr. GARDNER. Very likely; but I have told the gentleman and I have already said twice that it happened yesterday for the first time.

For the first time in the history of this country, so far as I know, a committee of this House has refused a hearing to one of the Members of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. No; I can not yield again. Five of our great ex-Secretaries of War and the Navy have prepared themselves to address the Committee on Rules in favor of a thorough investigation. One of the ex-Secretaries of whom I speak has prepared a special study of the question of the cooperation between the Army and the Navy; but the chairman of the Committee on Rules has declined to give us a hearing.

Now, what am I going to do with that former Secretary? Shall I invite him first to the secret sessions of Mr. PADGETT's Committee on Naval Affairs and ask him to wait there while the members complete their discussion of the proper locality for marine barracks? And shall I then ask that a day be assigned for a hearing before Mr. SHERLEY's committee on fortifications in the middle of a discussion about the cost of powder? And, next, shall I express my regret that he can not avail himself of an opportunity to present his ideas openly with reporters present in Chairman HAY's Committee on Military Affairs, because Chairman HAY, of the Committee on Military Affairs, yesterday notified his committee that all hearings for the season are over?

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes. After this I can yield only to gentlemen whose names I mention in debate. The time I am allowed to speak is limited.

Mr. HAY. If the gentleman is serious or was serious about having anybody heard before the Committee on Military Affairs, why did not the gentleman give me a list of the gentlemen he wanted to be heard, when every one of them would have been summoned? The gentleman himself would have been—

Mr. GARDNER. I have got the gentleman's question, and he need not complete it with a speech. The answer is that it was only yesterday that I received a notification from the chairman of the Committee on Rules that I must look for my forum to your committee, and no sooner had I received that notification than I was told that your hearings had closed. To go on with what I was saying: Imagine the delight of that ex-Secretary when he has completed his round in suddenly discovering that he has to go through it all over again with the committees of the Senate, and then imagine his further ecstasy when he finds that he has the committees of conference still to persuade.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, do you really think that four committees of the House and three committees of the Senate, all acting independently, can recommend a policy for our defense which will command the confidence and support of the country? If not, then the Speaker must enforce the rules of the House and require the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. HENRY] to call his full committee together before he can refuse my request for a hearing.

Now, the President—

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I will.

Mr. HENRY. I think there will be no difficulty about that. The Committee on Rules will be called together next Saturday, and I think the full committee will turn your request down in about half a minute.

Mr. GARDNER. Very good; but you can not do it without a yea-and-nay vote, and you will be put on record.

Mr. HENRY. I am ready to vote "yea" now.

Mr. GARDNER. I understand.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; if the gentleman will answer the question I asked him in his absence.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what question you asked in my absence. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER. I shall present it to the gentleman now, and we shall see whether we can make a trade.

Mr. HENRY. You were giving the gentleman the absent treatment.

Mr. GARDNER. I notified him twice.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say to the gentleman that it is but a short time since I came into the House, and I want to say also that I received word from the gentleman that he was going to make a speech this morning, and that he desired me to be present. I sent him word that I was engaged in a very important committee meeting and it was impossible for me to leave.

Mr. GARDNER. A message which I did not get.

Mr. PADGETT. I sent it, and I sent it in writing to Mr. MANN, the leader of the minority.

Mr. MANN. I will say that I received the word after I notified the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. That was the second message I sent. There is no harm done, because I am going to ask you the question now.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand. I understood the gentleman stated I was holding a secret meeting of the committee.

Mr. GARDNER. I said nothing of the sort. I said that until yesterday you held secret meetings of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Do you deny it?

Mr. PADGETT. I will say it is incorrect. I have never denied anybody admission that wanted to come in.

Mr. GARDNER. Do you admit newspaper men?

Mr. PADGETT. I never have denied any newspaper man.

Mr. GARDNER. Do you admit newspaper men as a matter of practice?

Mr. PADGETT. I will when they want to come.

Mr. GARDNER. If you admit them, they do not know it.

Mr. PADGETT. They never asked until yesterday or day before yesterday, and I granted their request, and I believe there was one there day before yesterday.

Mr. GARDNER. I never started to stir the matter up until the day before yesterday.

Mr. PADGETT. And there were a dozen there yesterday and to-day.

Mr. GARDNER. And there will be plenty more.

Mr. PADGETT. They will be welcome at any time.

Mr. GARDNER. They never have been welcome until yesterday.

Mr. PADGETT. They never asked until then.

Mr. GARDNER. Everybody knew you would not have them.

Mr. PADGETT. I never have refused them and never intended to refuse them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that the messenger which the gentleman from Massachusetts sent to the Naval Committee to deliver a message to the Naval Committee was refused admission to the rooms of the Naval Committee?

Mr. PADGETT. I did not know it.

Mr. MANN. It is a fact.

Mr. PADGETT. When?

Mr. MANN. This morning.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not know it.

Mr. MANN. They refused to admit him to the room.

Mr. PADGETT. If he had brought his message to me—

Mr. MANN. I wrote out a message afterwards and sent it by the messenger.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further to a discussion in which I have no part.

Mr. PADGETT. My clerk delivered the message to me. The room was full of newspaper men and the members of the committee, and the fact that the messenger was not admitted while his message was admitted is immaterial.

Mr. MANN. He had a personal message, and you refused admission to the messenger.

Mr. PADGETT. My clerk received his message, and he delivered it to me, and I returned a message. Then I received your written communication, and I answered it, and you have it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. It is true that the messenger was not permitted admission to the room.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that war is not in order until we are prepared. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. I may say that the reporters were in the committee room yesterday and, I believe, the day before.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I shall now come to the question which I put to him in his absence. I read from the report of the General Naval Board—from the last one, because the current one has not been released yet—a statement to the effect that the inferiority of our Navy is progressive, and will continue to increase until a definite policy is adopted; I do not know who the officer was who penned that statement, but I challenge you to summon him before your committee. I challenge you to summon Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, before your committee. I challenge you to summon Admiral Willard H. Brown—

son before your committee. I challenge you to summon Admiral Richard Wainwright before your committee. Will you do it?

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say to the gentleman that I had Admiral Vreeland before the committee last year as the representative of the General Board, and his hearings are printed, in which, as a member of the General Board, he stated fully, completely, wholly, and absolutely his ideas and recommendations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman will let me give him questions to ask of Admiral Wainwright, he will gain a lot of information that he did not get last year.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not propose to make the gentleman from Massachusetts a member of my committee. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] just asked me why I did not give him a list of witnesses to summon, and he says that he would have summoned them. Now, when I give the list he begs the question. Do not you want to hear both sides?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. And I want to state that yesterday or day before yesterday we had before the committee Admiral Badger, a member of the general board of this year, who stated fully, completely, and absolutely the recommendations, and represented and spoke for the General Board. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a very obvious answer which I could make in reply.

Mr. PADGETT. One moment. I want to say further that the recommendations of the general board this year and last year, if adopted, would require an expenditure of not less than \$125,000,000 for new construction.

Mr. GARDNER. And the American people would say "Amen" to it.

Mr. PADGETT. They would not.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. EAGLE). Ten minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Is there any possibility of my having a few minutes more? I only ask enough time to answer some of these gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIS. I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes that I had reserved for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you. Perhaps I shall not use it all.

The President, by his refusal to permit the pitiless searchlight of publicity to be turned on the question of our military security, inspires the same confidence in our Army and Navy as a bank president would inspire in his institution were he to lock the door against the bank examiner.

ARBITRATION.

One thought of the President, and only one, almost beguiled me. I confess that my bosom swelled with patriotic pride when I thought of the President or his representative sitting at the head of the council table of the peace conference after the war is over. To be sure, the picture was a little dimmed by the thought that the conditions, as the President regards them, require him to lay aside his weapons and retain the gorgeous but impotent uniform of the referee when he approaches the representatives of the warring nations. Arbitration. What a grand word. Yet the two Hague peace conventions and the declarations of London have all been torn to shreds. That is all that Carnegie so far has got to show as a result of his \$10,000,000, except an unprepared England and an unprepared Belgium.

One thing more I had almost forgotten. I must concede as a scalp to Mr. Carnegie's hatchet one more trophy, even if the scalp is made of false hair. The pacifists tell us that their efforts have at least made every nation disclaim the responsibility for this war. To be sure, either the pacifists or else common sense have brought about that result. I expect that it was just common sense, because the advisability of making it appear that the other fellow started the war was taught many years ago in Bismarck's "Reminiscences," and Bismarck was surely an eminently common-sense gentleman.

Had Belgium, like Switzerland and Holland, put more confidence in her troops and less confidence in arbitration and "scraps of paper," she might to-day be free from the agonies of invasion.

Yet every "scrap of paper" to which America puts her sign manual must be redeemed from the first word to the last, cost what it may, and whether or not every other nation on earth repudiates its obligations.

But suppose that America, while adhering to its agreements, finds its path beset by nations with smaller consciences and bigger howitzers. How is it going to be then? Shall we be

able to meet the situation with mammoth rolls of Sunday-school signatures or with resolutions passed at peace meetings?

LULLABIES.

Those of us who think that if we keep as still as mice we may be invited to referee the end of this European prize fight prate cheerfully of the "United States of the World" and of the organization of an international police. Well, perhaps we may be a little nearer something of the sort when there is an international language, or when we have educated our people up to arbitrating the Monroe doctrine, or when we have been successful in persuading the labor unions of California to arbitrate the question of Chinese exclusion, and not long before. Pending that day, I should like to have a few more dogs of war, and I promise not to set any of them onto innocent passers-by.

Oh, I can sit in my easy chair and dream just like any pacifist. I can dream of the day when the organization of society will be such that burglars will no longer exist. Meanwhile I live in the country 3 miles from the station and half a mile from the nearest neighbor, and I propose to continue to keep a watch dog. Furthermore, in my absence my wife has a loaded revolver in her room, and, by the way, I have never noticed that her preparedness for war has manifested itself by a murderous desire to practice her military efficiency on the chickens. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Massachusetts occupy?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman occupied one minute less than his hour.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, some time before the session ends I expect to have something to say on the preparedness of this country for war. During the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] I called his attention to the fact that he had said that there was ammunition sufficient only for three-quarters of an hour for the coast-defense guns. In face of that fact, in the report of the Chief of Artillery, Gen. Weaver, for the current year, at page 16, is found this statement:

The ammunition now on hand and under manufacture is 73 per cent of the allowance fixed by the National Coast Defense Board.

Mr. GARDNER said that is right, but I think they are entirely wrong.

The National Coast Defense Board is what is known as the Taft Board. It was appointed by President Roosevelt, and its report was transmitted to Congress in a message by President Roosevelt on March 5, 1906.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I have been summoned out of the Chamber. Does the gentleman wish me to remain here?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to hear what I have to say, but what I have to say I desire to go into the RECORD with his speech, because of his statement that the board on whose report we have been expending money and preparing the defenses of the country are so ignorant that in their recommendations they are entirely wrong. I desire to put the personnel of the board in the RECORD, as well as the instructions given to them when appointed.

This is from the memorandum prepared by President Roosevelt when he appointed the board:

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1905.

A board, to consist of the Secretary of War and the officers herein-after named, is appointed to revise the report of the Endicott Board, which was appointed under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1885, to "examine and report at what ports fortifications or other defenses are most urgently required, character and kind of defenses best adapted for each, with reference to armament," and "the utilization of torpedoes, mines, or other defensive appliances," with further instructions to extend its examinations so as to include estimates and recommendations relative to defenses of the insular possessions.

The report of the Endicott Board, submitted 19 years ago, was very carefully considered by its distinguished members. It enunciated sound military principles and recommended the best application of these principles with the conditions then existing. It fully deserved the generous support it has received from Congress.

Nearly two-thirds of the land armament recommended by the board has been installed or provided for, but since the date of the report so many conditions then existing have been materially modified and the engines or implements of war have been so greatly improved and others untried or unknown, of undoubted value developed, giving a greater advantage to the defense that it is confidently believed our harbor defense can be completed effectively and satisfactorily with a much less expenditure of money than has been heretofore estimated. With this object in view, the board will recommend the armament, fixed and floating, mobile torpedoes, submarine mines, and all other defensive appliances that may be necessary to complete the harbor defense with the most economical and advantageous expenditure of money.

The board will also recommend the order in which the proposed defense shall be completed, so that all the elements of harbor defense may be properly and effectively coordinated.

Those were the instructions under which the board acted. In their report, speaking of the amount or the supply of ammunition that was to be provided for our coast-defense guns, they state:

The estimate for the ammunition covers the amount necessary to complete the supply that, in the opinion of the committee, should be provided in order to meet any attack that may be made and is in addition to the money already appropriated.

Who signed the report?

William H. Taft, Secretary of War, president of the board; Adna R. Chaffee, lieutenant general, United States Army; J. C. Bates, major general, United States Army, Chief of Staff; Charles M. Thomas, rear admiral, United States Navy; J. P. Story, major general, United States Army; A. W. Greely, brigadier general, Chief Signal Officer; William Crozier, brigadier general, Chief of Ordnance; A. Mackenzie, brigadier general, Chief of Engineers, Samuel M. Mills, brigadier general, Chief of Artillery, C. S. Sperry, captain, United States Navy; George W. Goethals, major, General Staff, secretary of the board.

It is upon the study and report and recommendation of these men that our coast defenses have been modernized, and in accordance with their opinions and reports Congress has been appropriating the money required. They have determined the number of guns, they have determined their position, they have determined the auxiliaries necessary, they have fixed the amount of ammunition which Congress should provide, in order to have our coasts adequately protected. And yet, in the opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, they are entirely wrong. These distinguished gentlemen should be eliminated and relegated to private life and the guns and their position, the searchlights and the fire control, the amount and character of the ammunition to be provided, the money to be appropriated by Congress, should be determined not by men of their caliber, training, and experience, but out of the phantoms of the imagination of the gentleman from Massachusetts, who earned well-deserved reward and encomiums by a brilliant service in the Spanish War. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. What is the date of the report from which the gentleman has been reading?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was transmitted to Congress by President Roosevelt, who appointed the board under the date of March 5, 1906.

Mr. GARDNER. One other question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Permit me to add one more thing.

Mr. GARDNER. May I ask one more question of the gentleman?

Mr. FITZGERALD. When I have finished this statement. In the report of the Chief of Coast Artillery, Gen. Weaver, for the present year, to which I have just referred, he states on page 16 of the report—and I have heretofore stated that all of the necessary or desirable information about our defenses is available and at hand and at the command of gentlemen, depending entirely upon whether they are seeking information or notoriety [applause on the Democratic side]—on page 16 of that report Gen. Weaver says:

All of the defensive projects for the coasts of the United States and its over-sea possessions which have heretofore been approved have been carried to completion with but few exceptions.

He points out specifically what they are, and points out specifically what is still to be provided additional. I undertake to say that anyone who will examine the report from a single page of it can tell just how much there is in this agitation about the unprotected condition of our country. Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman himself agree with that recommendation in 1906 that there should be only one hour's supply of ammunition in reserve for our seacoast defenses?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did I agree with it?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; do you?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not having the requisite military and technical training to determine how much ammunition it is necessary to have at hand at any seacoast defense in order that that coast might be properly protected, I have acquiesced in the recommendations and determinations of the men whom we have educated to inform us on these questions, and the Congress has appropriated accordingly. So far as the coast defenses or the defenses of the canal are concerned, the gentleman made reference to me in that connection by stating that I conducted the hearings for the canal defenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, may I have some more time?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And that an investigation would be an investigation of myself by myself. Let me refer the gentleman to page 1971 of the hearings, volume 1, Sixty-second Congress, second session, of the Committee on Appropriations, wherein the question of the fortifications of the canal was investigated. At that time I called attention to the fact that we had then before us an estimate for \$220,000 for submarine mines as a part of the defenses of the canal that had not appeared in the report of the board originally appointed to determine what defenses were required. Upon the original board to make that report was the expert whom the gentleman wishes now to have called before the Committee on Military Affairs, Gen. Wotherspoon. And not only has the \$220,000 that appeared in Congress for the first time in the estimate for 1913 for submarine defenses for the Panama Canal, as a part of the defenses of the canal, been appropriated, but \$55,000 additional, which in the meantime it was said was required for additional submarine defenses. I undertake to say that the Committee on Appropriations, with the acquiescence and approval of the House and of the gentleman from Massachusetts, has recommended and has appropriated every dollar that was essential during the nine years that I have been connected with that committee for the defenses of our country. [Applause.]

Before the session of Congress ends I shall make a statement about these matters, and I shall so completely demonstrate the truth of that fact that all of the ex-Secretaries or others seeking notoriety in trying to revamp things published in their annual reports perhaps will not be so anxious to appear before the public in respect to these matters.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from New York should say that the five ex-secretaries are seeking notoriety. I am sorry that he should imply that I am seeking notoriety. However, it is quite possible that I may be seeking notoriety. At all events, here is the fact about that ammunition. The National Coast Defense Board in 1906 recommended that we should have only one hour's ammunition in reserve for our seacoast mortars and an hour's ammunition for our seacoast guns. The gentleman is right about that—in 1906. He says that he puts trust in the recommendations of the board. Then for heaven's sake why have we not given our coast defenses that one hour's ammunition. The report which the gentleman read showed that we had only 73 per cent, or three-quarters of an hour's ammunition for our guns on the seacoast and 50 per cent, or one-half hour's ammunition for our mortars on the seacoast.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But we have not suffered anything because they have not had the ammunition.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, no; we have not had any war.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that during the three years I have been chairman of the Committee on Appropriations we have appropriated for this reserve ammunition at about three times the rate that was appropriated in Republican Congresses. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER. I do not deny that. I have not looked into the matter. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields back one minute.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] his voice is for war. He says we are not prepared for war. I have heard that story before when an effort was being made for a larger Navy. I remember when a gentleman here said that within a twelve-month this Republic would be flat on its back and helpless with the hands of the yellow race upon our throats. Pray, Mr. Chairman, from what quarter does the gentleman from Massachusetts behold this war cloud that frets the sky? Is he expecting the Republic of Santo Domingo to unloose its mighty Senegambian hosts upon our country? I believe they have a standing army of about 46. Does he expect our neighbor, the Anglo-Saxon people at the north, Canada, to march an army down here and menace our liberties? Canada has no standing army. She has a population about one-fifteenth that of the United States. Is my bellicose friend from Massachusetts looking for Villa or Carranza to turn their ragged, motley hosts in

this direction? Where, my colleague, is this war cloud that has disturbed your rest and darkened your vision? Mr. Chairman, this great Republic in which we live, this great Empire of brave men and faithful women does not want a large standing army. Those who found this fertile soil separated from the conflicts of Europe, and builded here a resting place for those who love peace, did not believe that a great standing army was necessary to its perpetuation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When they were but struggling colonies scattered over this vast expanse they managed to establish the independence of the United States without a great standing army, and while our population was but 1,000,000, 2,000,000, or 3,000,000, and while our resources were as nothing compared with what they are now, this free people, without a standing army, maintained its principles against every foe. Have we come now, a free Nation of the earth, with 100,000,000 people, the richest nation upon the earth, to reverse the policy of Washington and Jefferson and set at naught the policy of the founders of the Republic and set about to imitate the crown-worn nations of Europe? I wish I knew from what quarter my friend expects trouble. It must be from far across the sea. Why, Mr. Chairman, Napoleon could not cross the English Channel in the zenith of his power to assail England. Does my friend believe that some country in Europe is going to load its soldiers upon transports and start them in this direction? Does he believe that these 100,000,000 people, brave and true, backed by the resources of the richest country in the world, would sit supinely around their firesides while that long and tedious operation was performed of loading transports with soldiers and bringing them to this country? No, Mr. Chairman; the military spirit has been rife in all the years of all the nations of the earth. It was rife at Carthage. Hannibal wanted war. It was rife at Rome. Cæsar wanted war. It was rife at Paris. Napoleon wanted war.

The great generals, the great admirals of this earth, Mr. Chairman, have set their faces for war in all the ages of the world, but in this country, to which men have fled from compulsory military service, in this one great Republic on this earth the mothers who clasp the hands of their daring boys do not want war. The farmer in his field, content to reap an independent support from the bosom of the earth, does not want war. The merchant and the minister, those who have made this country great and who are yet in the providence of God destined to make it greater, are not crying aloud for war. But my friend from Massachusetts says we are not prepared for war, he says "I challenge you" nine times in his speech, and if our country would assume the attitude that he assumes, then, indeed, we would need an army of five or ten millions of men and a navy that dotted all the seas to challenge the world. Well, I do not know whether we are prepared for war or not, but the taxpayers of this country think that we ought to be prepared for most any kind of a war. Just last Congress we appropriated \$100,000,000 for the Army and about \$150,000,000 for the Navy. I believe I am correct, Mr. Chairman, in saying that this is more money than the entire revenues of the Empire of Japan for a year. Then I would like to ask my friend from Massachusetts, sometime when he gets over this present hysteria of which he seems obsessed, to tell me what has been done with all the hundreds of millions of the people's money that has been expended on the Army and Navy of this country. But he says he is not seeking notoriety here. I do not know whether he is seeking notoriety or not, Mr. Chairman, but I do know he is going to be a very notorious man after this speech. I know this speech is going to cause him greater notoriety than he himself ever dreamed of, because as every mother in this fair land reads the speech of AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER she will look with fear and trembling into the faces of her sons and she will say, "Can it be true that we face compulsory military service in this country?"

Generals may be willing to give the sons of America to the Moloch of war, but the mothers of the sons of America do not want to bestow them in that unholy cause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is breathed into the breasts of admirals a desire for undying fame. There are some brigadier generals who want to be Hannibals, Cæsars, and Napoleons; but in the modest precincts of the peaceful homes of this country the one prayer that is breathed, the one hope that is expressed for the destiny and welfare of this country, is that she shall remain at peace with all the world [applause on the Democratic side], to work out her peaceful destiny without great armies, without great generals, and without great wars. I hold no brief for the defense of the President of the United States; but I should think, Mr. Chairman, that in the three or four months in which the world has stood aghast at the conflicts of men in foreign lands more mothers' prayers have ascended to the

throne of God for Woodrow Wilson than any other one man in this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But this is no time to talk of war. This is no time to talk of a great standing army. Great God, with fifteen or twenty millions of men in Europe grasping their swords ready to strike at their brothers and neighbors, does my friend from Massachusetts not find enough of that sort of thing? We read of the wars of the world, of the mighty Persian hosts; we read of the mighty hosts of Xerxes; we read of Napoleon's brilliant campaign with complacency; but when we look just across the ocean to-day and behold that which is occurring there, it seems to me that the martial spirit of even my friend from Massachusetts would find enough to satisfy itself. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Not a month ago an Austrian told me that he was going to try to get back home, because, he said, he had a letter from his mother that three of her five boys had lost their lives in the war.

Mr. Chairman, great armies are never justifiable except in defense of liberty or to strike from the hands of men the shackles of oppression and of tyranny. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would fear to trust the destiny of this Republic in the hands of admirals and generals. Their game is war. The glory that they shall get, if they get glory, is from war. I am willing to have a small army as a sort of police force. I am willing to have as good a navy as we need to protect our commerce and our country. But, Mr. Chairman, I dread the day that the military power shall take precedence over the civil power in this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Can you point to a nation of militarism that maintained the liberty of the people? Liberty can not live and breathe in an atmosphere of war and military power. O God of this world, give us this one spot upon which to maintain a free Government. [Applause.] Separated from all the warring nations of the earth by broad oceans, separated from our neighbors by almost impassable barriers, it would seem that God had planted this great people here to work out a shining example of liberty. I hope we may never again hear the tramp of soldiery upon these independent shores.

My friend referred to the war between the States. Is he looking for another war of secession? Mr. Chairman, I hope it will never come. He wants a large standing army. Does he look for a war between capital and labor? I hope it may never come, and I wish my friend might go home this night and put his head upon his pillow, read Washington's Farewell Address, and go to sleep and not disturb his brain with the thought that we need a great standing army or that we are about to be engaged in war. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The God of Nations has given us a President who loves peace and who has the courage to maintain the peace. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He has richly endowed us in this emergency not with a Mad Mullah of modern politics, not with a Rough Rider or discoverer of unknown rivers, but, thank God, He has given us a Christian gentleman, who is not to be shaken or disturbed in the execution of a great duty he owes to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And it is fitting in this great conflict in which millions are engaged that we should have no part.

We look upon their conflict with eyes full of tears and hearts full of sadness, and every mother and every son and every patriot should now and always firmly resolve that we will maintain this Republic as a republic, that it shall be an asylum for those who would escape armies and wars and conflicts and enforced military service; and instead of my friend crying, "Let slip the dogs of war" his prayer should be one of thanks that we have in the White House a President who will preserve this country from the contagion of war. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, that concludes what I wanted to say. It is a subject that I have always felt deeply about. I love this Republic; I love liberty; I hate armies; I hate despotism. I would not bunch the tears of a nation to make a diadem for a king. I am always thinking of Napoleon and the hundreds of thousands of French peasants and French soldiers that lay dying on the snow-capped hills of Russia during his retreat. I care nothing for Charlemagne and all his glory to be divided among his crazy sons. But, Mr. Chairman, I have dreamed that this Republic, standing out single and alone in the world, where men could have government based on the consent of the governed, should yet belle the history of the world and leave a proof that men are capable of this sort of government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used 18 minutes and yields back 12 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be called down at the end of 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I may be mistaken, but I thought there was an agreement that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was to follow the next speaker.

Mr. SISSON. That was not my understanding from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be captious in the matter, but there was a very clear and definite understanding that at the close of the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] was to speak for 30 minutes, and I was to follow him. I am not at all insistent upon it, and shall not be. There was to be only one speech.

Mr. SISSON. My understanding was that the gentleman from Massachusetts was to consume an hour, which he consumed, and then I gave the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] permission at that time to speak for 30 minutes, and then I was to have the other 30 minutes, making the hour's division.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] spoke night before last for 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. It is true we had an agreement with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. SISSON. Well, I do not wish to violate any agreement at all. The gentleman from North Carolina is not here, and I do not make any sort of contention as to my right in his absence, if the gentleman shall insist upon it, but it was my understanding that I follow Mr. DIES. I want to assure the gentleman I was not endeavoring to take advantage of the absence of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANN. I will say that I had an understanding with Mr. PAGE last night, and this morning he confirmed it.

Mr. SISSON. I suppose that he expected Mr. DIES to consume his 30 minutes and that is the reason he is not here, but it was understood when Mr. DIES took the floor that I was to have the remaining 30 minutes of the hour, or I should not have given him that opportunity.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, as I am the only person particularly interested in this matter, I want to say that I expect, of course, the gentleman from Mississippi will go on. It was understood he was to follow the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. But it was not the understanding that there should be any intervening speeches.

Mr. SISSON. Of course I knew nothing of the understanding. I want to say to my friend from Wyoming that I do not think I shall consume all of the 30 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will consume all the time he desires. I do not make the suggestion because I do not want him to speak.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] is not here now, and if he does not return when I shall have concluded I shall recognize the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. We are not doing anything here. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. We are trying to make an arrangement among gentlemen. Of course you would not understand what that meant.

Mr. DONOVAN. Proceed to business, then.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. MANN. After the conclusion of the speech by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] this morning, I saw the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], while the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] was talking, and the gentleman from North Carolina told me that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] would have 30 minutes and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] 30 minutes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Connecticut, who will not be in the next House, wants an extra session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. DONOVAN. I withdraw my point of no quorum, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut withdraws his point of no quorum. One hundred and one Members are present—a quorum. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] is recognized.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the European war presents to my mind a situation entirely different from what is presented to the minds of some other people.

In the first place, we were taught by a certain school of military philosophers that preparedness meant peace and not war. I do not suppose that anybody contends that that philosophy will longer be maintained, because the struggle going on to-day in Europe is one of preparedness that holds the world aghast. No man knows what its ultimate outcome can be, even though it is generally believed that the allies will finally win, and if they do what will be the condition of Europe then? If they do not win, then what? The wisest can not tell. As a gentleman, one of my colleagues from Mississippi, said to me the other day, when the war in Europe is over one half of the able-bodied men will be in the grave and the other half will be on crutches.

This simply carries out the position which I took some months ago, in which I stated in a speech to this House that, irrespective of which side would win in a war, both sides would be losers thereby. I do not believe that philosophy that the education and the training of all the world is lost, but I believe that this war will call the world to its senses, and that there will be evolved as a consequence of this great struggle some method of policing the seas by a common force to protect commerce, and an understanding that in proportion to the population each nation shall maintain only a certain number of standing troops to police the nation. The illustration at our very door between the United States and Canada is an evidence of what may be done. Because under a treaty over 100 years old two little boats are maintained by the United States and two small boats maintained by Canada of a type 100 years old have been rebuilt several times there is not a fort on the Canadian border, but we peacefully transact our business one with the other. If this succeeds between Canada and the United States, with over a 3,000-mile coast line, why not apply the principle to all nations?

I find no reason now why we should hasten to increase the Army or increase the Navy. On the contrary, if we have an enemy on earth, I do not know it. But if we had an enemy sufficient to justify a great increase of the Army or of the Navy, then this is certainly not the time to make the increase, because if the war critics are right about it this war will continue at least a year. Many generals say it will continue for three years, and we may learn some great lessons from that war. There may be an outcome that will mean what the world has looked for so long and what an all-wise Providence may teach the world—the folly of great armaments—and when the time is reached we shall have saved the many millions that would otherwise be expended, for use in peaceful pursuits.

Now, I will call the attention of gentlemen who heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] this morning to some expenditures, and to ask you whether or not we have been doing our duty, even if we believed in great armaments. There were 41 nations that belonged to The Hague conference. I have here a statement of the expenditures of 31 of those nations. I shall not name all of them, but I want to call your attention to the amount of money expended by some of the great nations and then show you what the United States did.

Russia expended last year for her army and her navy \$304,000,000, in round numbers. Germany spent \$303,000,000 in round numbers. France spent \$289,000,000, in round numbers. Austria-Hungary spent \$100,000,000, in round numbers. Japan spent \$65,000,000, in round numbers.

Skipping the smaller nations, Great Britain spent \$335,000,000 on her army and navy.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman recognizes the fact that the United States pays the enlisted man in the Army \$15 a month, and the foreign nations that he has spoken of pay only a nominal wage to the soldier?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; I recognize that fully, and in recognizing that fact I want to call attention to the fact that if you were to try to keep pace in numbers with the standing army of Russia, in numbers with the standing army of Germany, in numbers with the standing army of France, it would bankrupt this Republic to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I have heard that intimation a hundred times on this floor. Is the gentleman aware of anybody in the United States, from the foundation of the Government to this day, who has ever proposed to keep a standing army of 700,000 or 800,000 men? I never have.

Mr. SISSON. I never heard of anybody doing it either, but I am endeavoring to state to gentlemen who contend that the Government is not doing its duty, by the expenditure of money for the Army and Navy that they are doing the Government in the past an injustice. They are not confining themselves to the facts, because when you take into consideration the fact that on one side we are separated by 3,000 leagues of the bounding sea, and on the other side by the 8,000 miles of ocean, from other great nations, it is not necessary that we should maintain a standing army in numbers comparable with those nations interlocked by boundaries one with the other. On the other hand, it would be stupid folly to keep pace with other nations in the size of the army.

No man contends that it is possible for a European nation to land troops here, except they do so in transports, and you hear men say that we have no Navy to prevent this. No longer ago than yesterday, sitting in the naval hearings, I heard Admiral Fletcher say that with the single exception of England the United States had by all odds the strongest and best Navy on earth. Yet you hear men say that we have no Navy. Everybody must admit the purpose of the naval defense is to prevent the landing of transports, because without a navy transports could be put in behind a naval force and our forts bombarded, and after you reduced one fort you could land shiploads of soldiery from across the sea. If we had no navy, that would be true, but if Admiral Fletcher yesterday testified to the truth, it would be utter folly for a nation to start toward our shores with large transports filled with soldiery, arms, and ammunition, even though they had an escort of battleships, for the reason that if upon the sea they should lose a naval battle they would not only lose their naval force but would lose the transports filled with the troops and arms and ammunition, which would be sent to their destruction. Therefore any man who says that we should have a standing army like anything in Europe is afflicted with hysteria.

I take it that the purpose of the agitation at this time is largely on account of the fears the timid may have, and it is got up by these people who are making enormous sums of money out of the manufacture of absorbent cotton, who are making money out of the manufacture of stretchers, out of the manufacture of powder and steel plates, and the munitions of war, kettledrums, and cannon—they are the men who profit by it and who are agitators of a great war preparation.

I want to call attention to another thing. Militarism has a hold in this country to an extent that some of us little dream of. Mr. GARDNER spoke of \$500,000 being expended in the cause of peace. Do we realize that the \$280,000,000 which we are expending for the Army and the Navy is enabling the war people to convert that into a great propaganda for war and for additional battleships? Has it been lost sight of that the people who make steel plates, manufacture powder and small arms, drums and fifes, gold braid, boots and shoes, and all other things that are sold to the United States to supply the Army—has it occurred to you that these are the men that are maintaining a great propaganda for this preparedness for war, and while you have expended in the cause of peace a half a million dollars you have expended many times more than that in the propaganda for war?

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. Of course I agree with the gentleman fully that this country does not want a large standing army. Does the gentleman mean to say that we ought not to be fully prepared for any and every possible emergency?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know what the gentleman means by "any possible emergency." I think we ought to be reasonably prepared to defend ourselves against those enemies, if such there be, that might come against us.

Mr. KAHN. Let me call the gentleman's attention to a little matter of history on the floor of the House. About two years ago there was a little controversy between a country on the other side of the Pacific and our own country about school matters, and the gentleman from Mississippi himself arose on the floor of the House and insisted that if Japan undertook to foist her propositions upon the people of California he was ready, for one, to go to war.

Mr. SISSON. My friend from California is mistaken about the occasion. I was not in the Congress at that time.

Mr. KAHN. It was in reference to the California land laws.

Mr. SISSON. It was in reference to the alien ownership of land and the passage by the California Legislature of such laws as they have in Illinois, Massachusetts, and to a certain extent in my own State, and in Oklahoma, and other States of the Union. I took the position then, as I take now, that the sovereign States under our scheme of government have the

right to pass any land law they see fit and proper not in contravention with the clause of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. KAHN. I agree to that.

Mr. SISSON. We have that right, as has been decided by the Supreme Court in more than a hundred cases, that the Federal Government—that is, both Houses and the President—could not invade the sovereign right of the State. I was unwilling to concede that any alien power of any nation on earth should say through the treaty-making power that we could not pass a land law which, in my judgment, was wise for the people, and before I would surrender that right of a State to any nation on earth I would fight. That is what I said, and everybody will agree with me about that.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman feel that if he wants to fight he must be prepared to fight?

Mr. SISSON. I say Admiral Fletcher testified yesterday morning that, with the single exception of England, we had by far the strongest navy on earth. I think we are prepared for war; and if we are not prepared, then there ought to be some wholesale investigation of the honesty, integrity, and ability of those men who have been spending these \$140,000,000 a year on the Navy and over \$100,000,000 annually on an army.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. If some great power—Germany, England, or any other country—that has battleships should offer to sell them to us at this time at a low valuation, just as Germany did to Turkey, does the gentleman think a single one of these gentlemen who are so alarmed about our unprepared condition would vote to buy those ships? Would they not want to have ships built in this country, even at greater cost to the Government?

Mr. SISSON. I think that is true. I think there is a propaganda of that kind. There is a propaganda of thrift and of profit, and when a man's occupation has gone his profit ceases.

Mr. KAHN. Is it not a fact that within recent years the Congress itself has directed that battleships be built in the United States navy yards, and is not the Government itself building them?

Mr. SIMS. Out of American material, at excessive cost.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman prefer to import material?

Mr. SIMS. If it is better or just as good and cheaper; yes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further. In answer to that question of the building of battleships, even in the Government yards, it is largely a question of assembling parts, structural steel and steel plates, which are manufactured, together with the bolts and everything else, by the Steel Trust and private companies. It is a mere assembling of the parts, that like the assembling of an automobile, where a factory gets the parts made for it. The profit on the steel plate goes on and the profit on the structural steel goes on, and all of those profits continue, and the profits are enormous, and I take it that if you were to take away from these people all of the profits, and take away the opportunity to make these vast fortunes and make them taxpayers and pay their part of it, and let the United States Government own its own mines, its own foundries, make all of its own steel, and not go into the market to buy it, and to maintain the price of Steel common—I take it there would be very much less propaganda when they became taxpayers and not tax consumers, when they became part of the Government that only paid and got no profits back. I take it that that would change their attitude somewhat. I do not say that those men are any worse than I.

If I were engaged in the manufacture of steel, I do not undertake to say that I would be absolutely blind to the profits I might make out of the business. I am assuming that human nature is practically the same all over the world. I take it that because a man puts his money in the operation of a great steel plant he has not lost any of the acquisitive desires he had prior to the time that he made the investment, and if the Government is doing business of this kind I take it that he would like to have the contract. If I were doing it, I would not hesitate a minute about trying to get the contract if I could. If the United States is to make proper progress in liberty, my belief is that it must be made along lines promulgating peace and not war. When I enter a conflict or a quarrel with one of my neighbors, and my neighbor knows that I am armed with a deadly weapon, the laws of the land say that I have done wrong in carrying my weapon concealed, because my adversary is sure to arm himself, and when we are both armed cap-a-pie, I am watching him, and the first false move that he makes to pull his handkerchief from his pocket—called the hip-pocket defense—there is man slain, and so it is in nations. When nations begin to mobilize their armies, well equipped with arms, the other nation strikes first, like the man armed with a revolver

shoots first to prevent his adversary getting in the first shot, and men en masse act like individuals do, and I believe that armed preparedness means war and not peace. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman stated that he felt human nature was pretty much alike everywhere, and I suppose he will concede also that human nature has been pretty much alike throughout all time.

Mr. SISSON. I think this, that human nature is gradually improving. I think the basic principles upon which the human being conducts his life are being gradually broadened. I believe we are making progress and advancement. I do not believe that we are still hauling our goods in sleds by oxen. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That does not change human nature's desires or ambitions; it is merely the vehicle by which those desires are accomplished. Let me put this question: The gentleman intimated, at least, that he thought some part of a so-called propaganda for war is inspired by the spirit of commercialism on the part of the people who furnish munitions of war?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; that is, the preparedness on both sides of the ocean.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then how does the gentleman account for the fact that before weapons of war and munitions of war became commercialized, when there were no such great factories as there are to-day, there were more wars than there have been since this commercial age?

Mr. SISSON. Why, that is easy to answer. In the first place, in early history, according to Novicow, a great Russian expert on war, men went to war to satisfy their appetites, and many wars in the ancient world were fought for the women of the other nations. Then many wars have been fought for selfish purposes and for the purpose of making slaves of men. Wars have been fought in the past for the purpose of getting more territory. In every instance in the world's history in the past wars have always been unjustifiable on the part of the aggressor, but they were made by human beings who were steeped in ignorance, uneducated, to whom the doctrine of brotherly love had not been proclaimed, and amongst whom the doctrine of the rights of man was unknown, that men are born with certain inalienable rights, and that among those are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Not only that, but men in those days and in those hours of trouble and trial, living close to each other, were prone to live off what other people had made; but in this age, when education and training all have taught us that we ought to make it to the interest of people not to go to war instead of making it to the interest of people to go to war, and recognizing that human nature, while better trained, willing to accord to each other rights which they were not willing to accord in the past, we should restrain that acquisitive desire and take away the inducement to take from each other by war that which they have. In that way, and in that alone, will you be able to bring about a state of peace in the world—to take away from the nations of the world by a peaceful system the means of accomplishing their acquisitive desire except along the civil paths of law and righteousness made by international laws and settled by international conferences, and when the nations have policed the seas with a common navy, and when nations shall limit the number of the soldiers they shall have in proportion to the population, solely for the purpose of upholding the police power of the State itself and not for the purpose of use against other nations, when that time shall come, as it will come, when you take away the commercial side of it, and when in time of peace men are not making preparations to be ready for war when the other nations are making the same sort of preparation, it must be done by some agreement among all of the nations, just as we settled the differences between the 13 independent nations in the very beginning of this Republic. We settled it by an organization, first, of confederation, then by a Constitution; and they have a common power. The Supreme Court of the United States is arbiter of the differences between those sovereignties, and by voluntarily surrendering a certain portion of our sovereignty to this common power we have had peace, though there are 48 parts now, with the single exception of the Civil War, and that trouble perhaps was in the impossibility of agreement at the time the contract was made; that has been settled and I hope is settled for all times. Now, we have 48 sovereigns who have delegated a portion of their powers to the General Government. This magnificent system of confederated power to a degree should extend to all nations. We can begin a confederation of the nations with each

other by saying each will limit the amount of armament and standing army. This can be done only by an international agreement.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That agreement, of course, must proceed out of the inclination of the people, taken collectively.

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. According to the standard recognized by the individuals who make up all the people.

Mr. SISSON. That is true.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. International or municipal laws are supposed to represent the standard to which the people have arrived and not the standard to which they aspire.

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then the gentleman admits we have not yet reached that point.

Mr. SISSON. I did not admit that yet; but I say—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I thought the gentleman said a moment ago it was a point which we "in time" would reach.

Mr. SISSON. There will be some sort of confederation, and besides that confederation there must be a disarmament to the extent—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But you can not get a confederation in the interest of disarmament if one nation persists in arming?

Mr. SISSON. That is true if it is one great nation; but I agree with the speaker that if any three great nations agree I doubt seriously whether the rest would go to war. Certainly five great nations could control the situation. This war in Europe is bringing about a new conviction in the minds of everybody, except the admirals, generals, and those people selling munitions of war, that wars should end. War has been made so terrible, so destructive of human life and property, so destructive of morals, leaving in every fireside vacant chairs and upon every door knob crepe, leaving oceans of tears along in the wake of it, leaving a destruction of country even worse, from the description, if possible, than at certain times of our own country during our Civil War.

Those of you who have been reared where victorious armies alone have trod, those of you who have been reared where you have not seen the sight of smoking dwellings, those of you who have been reared where you have never seen a soldier come and ruthlessly invade a private home, those of you who have lived where you have never seen a little home invaded and food taken away in the nighttime or taken away in the daytime do not know what war is. My childish eyes have looked upon a country desolate with war, and those were Christian soldiers under the Stars and Stripes who made that desolation; and if people living under the same flag can thus desolate a country, in the name of God what must go on where race hatred and race prejudice are as they are to-day in Europe. Is it possible that civilization, that education and Christianity, that a man's civilization is only skin deep? Are we still savages and brutes? I do not believe this. On the contrary, my earnest conviction is that if we could take away all the profits, if we could take away the military glory that these men are seeking, and if Germany could control her army instead of her army controlling Germany, then I believe the German people would be better off. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If Russia, instead of the Duma and a few privileged classes with the army, could control Russia, Russia would be better off. Is England to-day in any worse condition because she had a standing army of only 200,000 men? And yet she is mobilizing now at the rate of 500,000 soldiers every three months. Do you tell me that the enormous tax which the Russian people bore and the enormous tax the German people bore and the enormous tax the French people bore for 40 years in preparing for this conflict is to be commended? Is it not better, even though you may lose a few battle fields, to prepare for war when war comes? But, however wrong you may contend I am in that position, I say this without hesitation, that Europe would have been in infinitely better condition to-day, Europe would have been in a better condition to conduct herself for the future and to build up her future greatness had it not been for these powerful engines of destruction which the war has saddled upon the people of Europe.

To-day the war debt of the five great nations of Europe is \$27,000,000,000. France, owing \$7,500,000,000, for the last three years was unable to pay the interest on her consols, and had to borrow money from her own people and issue new consols to pay the interest on her old ones. Therefore she has reached the point where to pay her current expenses she was bankrupt. Will you tell me what the financial world will do and how the European countries will be able to maintain themselves with this enormous indebtedness rolled upon the \$27,000,000,000? And that \$27,000,000,000 does not include the debt of the Balkan

States, nor the little Swiss debt, nor the debt of the Scandinavian States, but only the debts of the great nations of Europe. In the name of God, would not the condition of war, except for the loss of life, be almost as good as the conditions of peace. If the bondholders and those who are financing this trouble shall have a mortgage upon posterity and use the armies of the people in time of peace to collect from a down-trodden, debt-ridden people the interest on these consols and these bonds? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. Sisson. Is it possible that we propose to put ourselves in that condition where our indebtedness will be such that when we shall have paid our current expenses we will not have enough money to pay our interest on the bonds? Why, my fellow Members, I can not subscribe to that doctrine. Slavery in one form is to my mind as objectionable as slavery in another, and I am unwilling to become a slave myself to those people who shall finance the people in their expenditures for debts caused in preparing for war in time of peace.

Mr. Chairman, I want to extend my remarks by putting in the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Watterson, the editor of the *Courier-Journal*, of the date of December 8, as follows:

SHALL OUR AMERICAN REPUBLIC BE PRUSSIANIZED?

"Dear God and Father of us all,
Forgive our faith in cruel lies,
Forgive the blindness that denies!

"Cast down our idols! Overturn
Our bloody altars! Make us see
Thyself in Thy humanity!"

—John Greenleaf Whittier.

I.

"An inquiry into the state of the Nation's defenses"—the high-sounding sobriquet of the movement started by the plate-armor combine to rob the people and fathered by a Massachusetts Congressman—were more fitly and accurately entitled "A plan to put Woodrow Wilson in a hole," and for other purposes, the "other purposes" being a taking issue and campaign funds for the Republicans, along with galore of personal exploitation for the spread-eagle orator whose favorite stunt is "to wrap the flag around him, march down to the footlights, fire two boss pistols and die like a son of a gun!"

The scheme presents three distinct aspects for the consideration of reflecting men; first, its fraudulent, partisan character; second, its empty patriotic appeal; and third, its untimely promulgation of a wicked principle.

"I am very much afraid," says Mr. GARDNER, eager to get in his work and unable to restrain his partisan intention, "that the President means to lay the cold hand of death upon the whole movement."

But how could the President do that? The "movement" is for the Congress, not for the Executive. Even here, however, the GARDNER prejudice of the President is supplemented by the charge made in advance that the Rules Committee will not allow it. Thus, before the assembling of Congress, we had proof that the proposed "inquiry into the state of the Nation's defenses" was not an emanation of patriotic solicitude, but a play for party advantage.

Coincident appears a yet more sinister figure upon the scene. This is an association calling itself "The National Security League." Its arrival would be suspiciously prompt even if we did not know that every job big enough to pay its way along the turnpikes and through the tollgates of legislation always reinforces its invisible lobby with a marching club of noisy zealots—willing dupes of the drum and life—who dearly love to carry torchlights and are ever ready to rally around bonfires and pie counters.

The Nation to all such is in perpetual peril. If it were not, what would become of the professional lifesavers? Sixty years ago, according to the Know Nothing rescript, the Pope was going some dark night to swim the Atlantic and, like a duck upon a June bug, swoop down upon the helpless Stars and Stripes. These 10 years, since Japan licked Russia, it has been the Mikado, who, like a submarine, was going to swim the Pacific and swoop down upon Chinatown. Statesmen with osculatory intellects and 22-inch collars, seeking to establish a system of paternalism, based upon woman suffrage and prohibition, have never wearied of depicting the terrors of invasion and rum. Year in and year out they have held up the Nation by the tail as a horrid example of unpreparedness and depravity. To whom the *Courier-Journal* has said, as it now says to Representative GARDNER and the National Security League, adopting the words which Capt. Simon Suggs on a memorable occasion addressed to Parson Jediah Bullin, "Don't crowd the mourners nor rush the growler!"

II.

Cold-storage statesmanship is the order of the day. Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE comes bravely to the support of his kinsman. When did this expert in the unfeeling arts of piousness, prejudice, and patriotism fail to note the nail on the barn door, seeing the door itself not at all? Premising that the Gardner resolution should be passed by both Houses, the Massachusetts Senator is reported in a recent interview as follows:

"We hear it said that from our Regular Army and militia combined we could not at this moment get together 120,000 men for our defense. It has been publicly stated that we have not sufficient ammunition even for such troops as we have; that our fortifications for our great cities are very insufficient; that we have few, if any, guns of greater range than those on battleships; that such troops as we have, instead of being concentrated at the points where they are needed, are scattered through the country at different posts in positions where there is no need of troops. It is said that we have nothing resembling reserves, either of men or ammunition, and no sufficient arrangements made for providing mines to protect our harbors. I for one would like to know, and I think the American people would like to know, whether or not there is truth in these statements."

This would seem to be an accusation of somebody. It reads very like an indictment. Yet, subjected to a little analysis, it misses the

mark intended—that is, the present Democratic administration of the Government—because, if there be any thing wanting to our national defense, it lieth not with the Democrats but with the Republicans. For whatever is or is not they are solely responsible. From the 4th of March, 1897, to the 4th of March, 1913—16 years—the Government was in the hands of the party of which Senator LODGE is a leader. Most, if not all of the time, he has been a member of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. How comes it that, with vast moneys expended annually and things going to the bad, as he now describes them, this is his first warning to "the American people"? Why was he silent when at any moment the despots of Europe, having nothing else to do, might sneak into Boston and sack Faneuil Hall or crawl up through Simms Hole and cut the throats of every mother's son of us here in Kentucky? Was it his loyalty to McKinley; his love for Taft; or did he think that Teddy could frighten them away by a look? But now, now that the outer world is fighting like mad, exhausting itself, destroying itself, with nothing across the horizon to disturb the most patriotic Republican except a Democrat in the White House and a Democratic majority in Congress, Senator LODGE, at once alarmed and economical, wants to know, you know! As if the official reports were not both voluminous and accessible, he uses such terms as "we hear it said" and "it has been publicly stated."

And what is it that this veteran official, failing to inform himself, has "heard"? That the Army is short of soldiers? Whose fault is that? The Army is what the Republicans made it. That it lacks ammunition? For what? Is there an enemy anywhere in sight? That the troops we have "instead of being concentrated at the points where they are most needed are scattered through the country at different posts in positions where there is no need of troops." Where is there the need of troops? New England seems reasonably peaceable. Since Beach Hargis was sent to State prison the boys up in Breatthitt have simmered down. In spite of HOBSON, "all is quiet along the Potomac." Where would Senator LODGE have President Wilson send the troops, even if they were in possession of adequate arms and sufficient ammunition?

But—horrible to relate—our cities are undefended; the fortifications are tumble-down and mounted with popguns. Again, who is to blame if not the Republicans, and what have they done with the vast sums of money they have pretended to be spending all these years?

Senator LODGE—we are quoting him as reported by the *New York Sun*, a friend and not an enemy of the proposed inquiry—multiplies the counts in his arraignment of his party. The Republicans have done even worse by the Navy than by the Army. Here, being of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Massachusetts statesman ought to be an authority. What could Mr. McKinley, Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Taft have been thinking of when they let things go to such rack and ruin? During the 10 years between 1903 and 1913—6 of them under Roosevelt and 4 of them under Taft—more than \$1,200,000,000 were spent on the Navy. Now, these Republican agitators tell us that we have little other than junk to show for it and charge it to the Democrats, whilst the plate-armor people stand around and say "We don't need any foreign contracts. As soon as Congress meets we shall have plenty of American contracts. Mr. LODGE will fix it in the Senate and Mr. GARDNER in the House." But let us resume our interesting citation by a Republican of his fellow Republicans. Senator LODGE continues:

"If we turn to the Navy we can read in the newspapers almost every day statements of a similar character. I know myself that we are short of scout cruisers, having only three. A proper number of fast scout cruisers is essential to the efficiency of the fleet."

"We are insufficiently supplied with aeroplanes and hydroplanes, which are so essential to modern warfare."

"We have a large number of submarines—not enough in proportion to our fleet—but it is stated that many of those of early types are not at all up to recent standards and would be practically useless. It is said that we have only one torpedo to each torpedo tube."

"We ought to have the truth about these things, and then it is for the American people and nobody else to decide what they intend shall be done. It is not a party question in any sense, and the national defense ought never to be a party question."

No, it is not "a party question" if the Republicans are to be held responsible, but it is "a party question" where the Democrats may be held; for, as Senator LODGE concludes, "We are spending some \$250,000,000 a year on our Army and Navy and we ought to know what we are getting for our money and whether for that money we are securing the highest possible efficiency," his preceding remarks tending, if not intended, to arraign the Wilson administration.

In the Senator's despite, and in defense of the administration, the *Courier-Journal* might with deference submit that Mr. Wilson may have his doubts about the expediency of spending great sums of money upon armament for which there will be no immediate use and which by the time it is called for may be obsolete and valueless.

Where is the urgency that excites Representative GARDNER—the exigency that impels Senator LODGE—the danger that arouses the National Security League?

To meet the dilemmas suggested by these questions, the organizers of the new war party cite the accomplished ex-Mayor George Brinton McClellan, of New York, now a professor at Princeton, who does not believe that the European war will bring about universal disarmament and peace. On the contrary, he thinks that when it is over it will be only a question of soon or late when we shall have to stand by our guns. They quote him as follows:

"No matter who wins, it is almost certain that at some not far-distant time we shall be confronted with the alternative of either abandoning the Monroe doctrine or fighting to maintain it. We have made of it a great national principle, a question of national honor, so that if we abandon it we must concede that we are not strong enough to maintain it; that we are only a second-class power, at the mercy of all the swaggering bullies of the earth. If we fight for it in our present unprepared condition, there can be but one outcome. A triumphant and victorious Germany would have little to fear from us, and while we might possibly in the end be able to check Japan by herself, we could scarcely hope to do so if she received help."

The *Courier-Journal* has said something like this: If the Kaiser could win, it would become a certainty. In that event Germany would rise on its hind legs and say "To hell with your Monroe doctrine." But the Kaiser can not win. When the allies have finished him they will be too much played out to think about any more fighting.

Naturally England, being our next-door neighbor and foremost competitor for markets, would be likeliest to tackle us. But the impediments are almost insuperable. Outside of trade neither wants what the other has. England was, and is, and will continue to be, in favor of disarmament. It was Germany that, requiring foreign exits and entrances, and resolved and prepared to fight her way out, forbade. With

Germany prostrate and the others exhausted—the isolation of the United States still our best defensive—it will be our own fault if we have to go to war with any nation. Hence, Prof. McClellan's appeal that Americans "awake to their present condition of unpreparedness, and that immediate steps be taken to build up a national defense," coming from the son of a soldier, if not a soldier, loses much of its force and should not be regarded especially relevant to the discussion.

III.

Backed by a self-constituted and self-styled body of exclusive patriots—the National Security League, obviously organized and financed by the plate-armor people—it is at once an effrontery and an affront, not to say a stupidity, in Representative GARDNER to sneer at the President as "a hopeless pacifist," and to turn upon dear old Andrew Carnegie as the enemy of his country and his kind.

"In my opinion," says the Massachusetts warrior, "the effect of the vast sums of money spent by Mr. Carnegie in his peace propaganda has been to blind Americans to the fact that our national security from a military point of view is undermined"; adding that "every Army and Navy officer to whom I have spoken tells me the same story of inadequate security," as if he could expect any other testimony from witnesses whose trade is war.

All this while Mr. GARDNER tells us nothing we did not know before. His proposed "inquiry" could lead to nothing not already to the hand of every Member of Congress. As well arraign Jesus Christ for preaching peace on earth, good will to men, as Andrew Carnegie for taking the word out of the mouth of the Savior and contributing millions of money to spread its blessed portent throughout the world.

Before the war in Europe the cause of arbitration as an international agency was making progress. But the voluntary disarmament of the nations was obviously a long ways off. It seemed to most people an iridescent dream. With what is going forward it becomes at least a possibility.

There have been wars and wars. As far as history reaches backward blood has been the single recourse of diseased ambition, the only balm for wounded pride. There have been wars and wars, dynastic wars, religious wars, territorial wars, but never a war like this; heroism driven from the earth, mercy vanished from the heavens, individuality lost in brutish multitudes and death-dealing machinery, pity fled, generosity dead; in place of glory the gluttony of greed and hate, the agencies of blind, unsparring destruction. Reflection stands aghast, pity appalled; yet there must be an end—it can not last forever—and when it is over, when murder has done its worst, when exhaustion hangs limp over barren fields and despair stares gaunt and silent into the cannon's mouth, mayhap thought will still hover about the scene and reason whisper to those that survive its horrors; mayhap at dead of night the Christ shall steal through the shadows to fasten His spirit upon the souls of men. Then, but not till then, our time will come.

What shall be our attitude? Shall it speak for civilization? Shall it rise for the Christian religion which we profess, standing uncovered to the sun in robes of living light, or shall we appear, like Mars, cap-a-pie, in full armor, the old dread specter of fury and force? Shall we say to Europe, "Fight no more"—henceforth the world shall be at peace and it shall be written over the portals of every people, "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

There is hope that something may come of it. Germany beaten—perhaps ground to the dust even as Belgium is—will be, must be, disarmed. Then, why not the rest? The debts will remain to be paid. The men will be needed in the fields. But if to get a party issue in America a group of baffled political leaders are permitted to Prussianize our Army system under the plea of national defense, laying the foundations for a militarist at Washington like that at Berlin, in the interest of corrupting murder mills and ambitious soldiers, it will be but a question of time when what is happening there will happen here. In short and in fine, a question the people should begin to consider is, Shall we fall in with Senator LODGE and Representative GARDNER to worship at the shrine of Krupp, even to the footstool that holds the Kaiser's feet, or follow the genius of the American Republic up the steps of the throne of God?

Even the Prussian militarist, with the Kaiser at its head, must begin to see the futility of its Pan German scheme of world conquest. When all is lost they will fully realize it. Forty years the Germans have been taught by their philosophers to believe that war is the state of man. Forty years their professors and historians have told them it was the hope of Germany. During these years the armor makers and the saber rattlers—who derive a profit from war and for whose benefit myriads of good men are fed to powder—were preparing for war.

It will not do for any German now to put up a poor mouth and to attempt denial of this. That there was provocation—especially in England and France—may be true enough. Germany had been commercially put in a pocket. There was sore need of colonial expansion. The mistake lay in the idea that war was a remedy, that it was inevitable, and that, if it was bound to come, Germany was best prepared for it—England supposed to have her hands tied in Ireland and no one suspecting the Belgians of such power of resistance.

It was precisely the mistake that Napoleon made. Two years before his fall Napoleon could have secured world peace and the confirmation of his dynasty, with a larger France than he had found. He refused it and went to his finality. All his calculations failed him, as all the Kaiser's calculations have failed him. The very elements rose against him, as they have risen against the Kaiser. It seems a doom fixed upon God-defying ambition.

Let us agree that no such opportunity was offered the Kaiser as was offered Napoleon. Let us even allow that the Kaiser felt himself obliged to fight and that the defeat of his wondrous preparedness is not a punishment but a destiny. All things apart, to what end, if not to the substantiation of the truth that war is not a remedy for any earthly evil or wrong, that it is organized and legalized murder, and that, quite destroying its victims, it leaves its victors worse off than they were before?

This brings us face to face with what we have called our civilization, and that again brings us face to face with what we have called our religion.

Is Christendom a Christian? Are we, the American people, a Christian people? If in the green leaf we are thus to rush to our guns with Senator LODGE and Representative GARDNER, what may we not have to do in the brown? Is the Republican Party to repeat in the United States, under the guise of patriotism and the national defense, the selfsame error which lured Germany and the unknowing, unasked, unsuspecting German people into their present awful plight?

Is the Republican Party, beaten on the old issues, to reconstruct and revitalize itself by a popular appeal having the alleged glory and

prowess of the Nation for its text, war as its ultimatum—making a combine between the saber rattlers, the plate-armor makers, and the voters, as the German militarist, representing a feudal caste, the Kaiser at its head, made alliance with the German middle classes, embracing the money kings of Berlin and Hamburg and the infidel doctrinaires of Bonn and Heidelberg? In short, are we, the American people, to be led unconsciously into adopting the gospel of war and the setting up of an all-powerful military aristocracy, as the unhappy, the unfortunate Germans were?

Have we a Treitschke among us? Is his pseudonym HENRY CABOT LODGE? Have we a Bernhardt? Is his nickname AUGUSTUS PEABODY GARDNER? Nietzsche is dead; but his spirit liveth and roameth abroad, at the moment taking a look-in upon Congress.

Now, gentlemen, I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, I agree absolutely with the position taken by the President of the United States in his address to this House. I am unwilling that the Army should control America. I want America to control the Army. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am unwilling that we should prostitute our liberty and that the enormous amount of money taken and wrung from those people who work in factories, fields, and in mines shall be transferred to the people of the Army and Navy, who live in luxury in time of peace, without a chance of going to war but once in a lifetime. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention and is still my intention to introduce a complete novelty into this debate by discussing the bill now before the House for consideration. But even with so laudable a purpose as that in one's mind it is difficult in these moments of alleged "nervousness and excitement" with regard to preparedness for war to entirely overlook that tremendously important and at this time much-discussed subject. The gentleman from Mississippi, in his eloquent peroration, said he agreed entirely with the President of the United States in regard to this matter. I should have been much more enlightened as to just what he agrees to had I been able to understand just what the President's position on the subject was from what he said in his message. The President very adroitly, and in that splendid English of which he is the greatest master living, built a man of straw and then proceeded, with our entire approval, to demolish it. The President said that the American people would never agree to conscription and to making our country an armed camp. To all of that we say amen, and if there be a man under the flag who has ever suggested or proposed such an enormity let his name be anathema.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] gave us a lovely essay on the beauties and the blessings of peace. With most of what he said, as a matter of philosophy, we all of us entirely agree. The President suggested that there was something of excitement in regard to this matter. I had not thought so until I listened to the speeches to which I have referred. Now I am inclined to think that if there is not something of nervousness and excitement, there is a very evident disposition or temptation in connection with the discussion of this very important matter to exaggerate, if not to misrepresent. There is a real problem before the American people to-day, having to do with the question of preparedness for war, but it is not any more urgent to-day than it always has been and always will be, so long as men are as they are and so long as human nature is as it is. I for one do not agree with the plan proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] for a determination of the question as to what extent we shall prepare for hostile eventualities. I think Congress and its committees quite competent to do that. But I do think the gentleman from Massachusetts has done the country a real service in challenging the attention of the Nation to the question as to what extent, if any, we should under the present circumstances modify our policy of the past with regard to our military and naval establishments.

We are not prepared for all possible eventualities, and the President very properly stated that we never would be. We never are, as individuals, fully prepared to meet every accident, fully prepared to defend ourselves against all comers, and it would be the height of folly for us to attempt to be so prepared. A considerable experience in my youthful days in regions where men were inclined to carry the munitions of war and quick to pull taught me that those who were best prepared were most frequently those who got into serious difficulty, and it was generally the peaceably disposed, who took some chances, who came out the best in the long run. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] surely does not want us to understand, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] certainly does not desire that we should understand, that they, or either of them, or that any of their colleagues believe that we can blink or deny the

facts of history, or that we can close our eyes to the necessity of being prepared in a reasonable way to defend ourselves.

The question is, and the question has been, and the question always will be, To what length shall we, may we, should we go in preparation and in what direction shall we most press our efforts to place the Nation in such a condition that it shall be able with the least loss to meet any possible armed foe? All of those who have studied the question have realized that in the matter of reserves of war material we are probably not sufficiently prepared, looking at the matter from a reasonable standpoint. Last year there were discussions of the propriety of further increasing our reserve of certain classes of ammunition, the propriety of increasing our reserve of field artillery. There has been more or less discussion of these and like matters every year as the bills were taken up for consideration in the House and before the committees. The question has always been, How much expenditure for these purposes will our constituents approve, knowing the facts, and what expenditures are we justified in making, taking a reasonable view of the matter, based on the policy of being reasonably prepared for what may occur?

The probability is that we did not appropriate quite as much as we should have appropriated last year for fixed ammunition. I suggested that in a mild way—in my usual mild way—at the time. The probability is that we should have appropriated more last year for the reserve of field artillery. That has been something of a fad of mine for some years, and yet I do not think the Congress or the administration or anybody is open to any considerable amount of criticism because we did not appropriate more, for we appropriated more than we did the year before, and I think more than the year before that.

Now, if the agitation that has been started largely by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] shall place the people in a frame of mind where they shall be willing to approve reasonably increased appropriations along certain lines, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts will have accomplished a very excellent purpose. But I do not think the American people are either "nervous" or "excited" about it. Probably if we could know their minds we would learn that they believe we should considerably increase the number of air craft, auxiliary to our fighting forces. Possibly we might find the people agreeable to increasing the Navy a little more rapidly than in the past, particularly in the matter of submarines. Possibly we shall find a disposition on the part of the people to somewhat increase the size of the standing Army, for reasons to which I shall call attention in a moment.

So far, however, as to there being any reason or necessity at this time or any real demand at this time for any considerable increase of our naval or military establishments, there is nothing in the condition of the world to warrant a belief that such necessity exists, and certainly the American people as a whole do not at this time believe such a necessity exists.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McKELLAR). Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. FESS. As to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts about our limited ammunition, have you any facts as to our ability to supply ammunition in case a war were on, although we do not have it in possession now?

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is—and I am not an expert, as the gentleman knows, in regard to these matters—my understanding is that most of our ammunition can be manufactured very rapidly, and that with the exception of certain classes of ammunition, such as torpedoes, certain large fixed ammunition, large quantities can be manufactured in a comparatively short time. While we should have a reasonably good reserve, it is not necessary to have such an enormous reserve, constantly deteriorating, as some people imagine. It sounds startling to say that we have only ammunition for three-quarters of an hour for our guns were they all belching at their most rapid performance. But really that is an enormous supply of ammunition, comparatively speaking, for no one can conceive a condition under which all the guns or a major portion of them, active and reserve, could be brought into action at one time and fired continuously for three-quarters of an hour. This is true with regard to most forms of ammunition. Experts all agree, and laymen who have given the matter any study at all, as well, that a larger reserve per gun is now necessary than formerly, owing to the rapidity of fire of modern guns and the rapidity with which ammunition may be dissipated; and possibly, that fact being taken into consideration, we should increase our estimates and our reserves of ammunition above the amount which has heretofore been considered necessary.

Mr. FESS. May I ask the gentleman whether that is in his mind a serious situation—our not having very much ammunition in possession?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think, I will say to my friend, that there is any fact connected with our military situation that need disturb us now more than at other times. In fact, I am of the opinion we are now rather better prepared than we have been in the past. That is not saying, of course, that we are as fully prepared in all respects as we should be. I think we are not.

As I see it, we stand in no greater danger now than in the past. On the contrary, the probability, the chances, of our being engaged in war are lessened rather than increased by the war in Europe, and we can and may and should discuss all of these questions without regard to what has occurred or what is occurring in Europe, unless it be to this extent: That the war in Europe up to this period has seemed to tend to prove certain things. One of them is that in future wars there will be a larger proportionate use of field artillery; that men need to know how to shovel as well as how to shoot; and that our reserves in certain lines should be increased.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman think it does not require greater diplomacy now to remain out of the war than before the war had begun in Europe?

Mr. MONDELL. I agree with the President of the United States, but I disagree with the campaign utterances of his party on the subject. I agree with him that there is no reason on earth why we should be involved in the European struggle, and my opinion is that except through some act of stupidity unthinkable, or some act of aggression unbelievable, it is not possible that we shall be brought into this great European struggle.

I confess to a profound hatred for war. I regret the necessity for military establishments, and in that I think I feel as the great body of the American people do. But I realize, as we all do, as matters now stand in the world, the necessity of maintaining a reasonable military and naval establishment. We shall differ in the future, as in the past, as to what constitutes a reasonable naval and military establishment. If this war has taught us some lessons in regard to reserves, in regard to the character of the arms that shall be needed, we should heed those lessons. If it has taught us something with regard to the conduct of war, we should heed those lessons in the conduct of our military establishments. There is, however, no necessity of our getting at all excited over the matter at this time because of what is occurring in Europe.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman fear that an increase of 25,000 men endangers the peaceful conditions, and that it would produce a militarism?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has anticipated what I was about to say and to which I referred a moment ago. I am one of the few people who did not believe it wise to fortify the Panama Canal. I have in no way changed my mind in regard to that matter, even though since then our faith in treaties of neutrality has received something of a rude shock. But we have entered upon a policy of fortification. Our guns and mortar batteries frown from either end of the canal. We must have a force of at least 15,000 men there or we should have no force at all. It would be the height of folly to attempt to maintain an establishment there unless we maintain a reasonably adequate one, and 15,000 men, according to all of the estimates of the military authorities, is the very minimum of force with which we could make a stand if we were attacked at Panama.

I called attention at the time I discussed the matter, when I was opposing the fortification of the Panama Canal, that it meant inevitably an increase of our military force by 15,000 men, unless we were of the opinion that the force we already had was 15,000 too large. We are increasing our garrison in Hawaii, and we are maintaining a certain force in the Philippine Islands. We can not reduce those garrisons under any condition of war or peace. When we put 15,000 men in Panama, we have drained from the force we have heretofore maintained at home that number, and we must increase our force from 15,000 to 20,000 in order to carry out the policy of placing a considerable garrison in Hawaii and maintaining garrisons in Panama which we entered upon some time ago. Such an increase would not be an increase at all, so far as our forces at home are concerned.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Did the gentleman oppose the fortification of the canal because of the belief that some of us entertained, that we owned the canal and had the supreme and absolute control

over it, or was it upon the later theory and recent legislation, which, in effect, surrendered very largely our ownership and control of that great piece of engineering?

Mr. MONDELL. I think I made it very clear that my opposition to the fortification of the canal was based on my opinion as to its unwisdom and not upon the theory that we did not have a right to fortify it. I did not subscribe to the doctrine which was crystallized into legislation which, as the gentleman from Nebraska very properly observed, surrendered not only our right to say what tolls should be paid but at the same time and through the same interpretation put in question our right to fortify the canal.

I said during that debate that, while I did not believe in fortifications there as a matter of policy, I would cut off my right arm before I would surrender my right to fortify. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Is not the corollary of the proposition which the gentleman has so well stated true—that if the European nations, and Great Britain especially, surrendered, as she did, to us the right to fortify the canal, acknowledged that we had the right to fortify it, is not that also a surrender of her position in regard to the tolls proposition?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman states it very clearly. Any interpretation of the treaty that denies our right to fix tolls puts in question our right to fortify. The two are effected by the same provisions of the treaty; and if we have not a right to fix or remit tolls, by the same token, as they say in the country, we have not the right to fortify it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman does not assume to say that we have surrendered any right to levy tolls in the Panama Canal, does he?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not like to admit surrenders, no matter how apparent they are, and therefore I will say no, even though we repealed the law differentiating in the fixing of tolls, on the argument that we had not any right so to do—that is, those of us who did not vote for the proposition did not surrender.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Government of the United States is the only power on earth that has the right to fix tolls on freight and passenger traffic through the Panama Canal, and have not we done it?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not think anyone else had the right to say anything about what we should do relative to our own ships until at the behest of Great Britain—

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman think so now?

Mr. MONDELL. Until at the behest of Great Britain we did, in effect, say that she had the right to say how we should fix the tolls on our own ships.

Mr. McKENZIE. But did we say it?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I did not surrender, for I did not vote for the Panama Canal surrender, I will say to my friend. My flag still flies. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. In all fairness, did not the gentleman so vote when the bill first passed the House?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I did not; because I stated very clearly then that I did not believe, as a matter of policy, that it was wise to remit tolls to our coastwise vessels. I thought it was better to remit the tolls to our over-sea commerce.

Mr. McKENZIE. And the gentleman was right about it, too.

Mr. MONDELL. That certainly was not a denial of our right to fix tolls, or to differentiate between different classes of vessels.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURES.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have taken very much more of my time than I intended to in discussing this very interesting subject of preparedness. There has been a good deal of talk and discussion, and because of it we will give a little more attention to the suggestions and recommendations of those who are in the position to know what we ought to do in order to be reasonably prepared, but we shall not be carried off our feet, and we shall not depart from our policy of maintaining only such an establishment as will ward off the first hostile blow and give time for the citizenship of the Nation to prepare for our perfect defense.

Mr. Chairman, I started to discuss this District bill, but it seems to be the hardest thing in the world in the House at times to discuss the matter under consideration. Some of the newspapers of this city have been inclined to express regret be-

cause the District Commissioners did not make larger estimates, because they left out some rather important projects, and because they trimmed their estimates all along the line.

I was interested in their action largely by reason of a statement made by Commissioner Siddons as to the conditions or considerations which affected their judgment. He said on behalf of the commission:

Bearing in mind, first, that our estimated revenues show a very considerable increase over last year—

That is, the District revenues—

the commissioners were nevertheless aware of the fact that it was not only desired but the probable necessity throughout the Government to reduce expenditures to a minimum * * * and bearing in mind the general situation in the country and what the Congress probably has to face in the matter of the necessity of reducing expenditures wherever possible, we have fallen in line with that general view and understanding.

Mr. Chairman, we all believe in economy, not only under Democratic administrations which are pledged to economy by their platform utterances, but at all times and under all administrations, and yet we have the very highest authority, recently given, for the fact that the American people desire Congress to make such appropriations as are reasonably necessary for carrying on the people's affairs, their only insistence being that the expenditures shall be for proper objects and that honesty and good business judgment shall be exercised in making the expenditures.

What is the condition of the country which the commissioners had in mind when they said in effect that it was such as to necessitate their bringing in a very closely clipped and cropped set of recommendations of expenditures? The ability of the Government to pay its bills depends entirely upon its revenues, and its revenues are derived from two sources in the main—internal revenue and revenue from customs duties. So far as I know, except for the extension of the wave of prohibition, and that does not seem to have had much effect, there has not occurred anything to reduce the income from internal revenue. Our other large source of income is customs duties, and there is no reason for a falling off of revenue from customs duties based on any reduction in the amount of imports. Just now in addition to ordinary sources of revenue we have this new so-called war tax, which makes it a little bit trying for the children in the matter of chewing gum, a little more difficult to get married, hard on the man who has any bank stock, and still harder, as I have recently discovered, on the fellow who wants to borrow money at the bank. Ninety million dollars, we have understood, are to be raised through this so-called war tax, necessitated, so the President assured us, by reason of a reduction of imports resulting from the war in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the trouble to secure a table of importations for the 13 months ending October 30 last, during all of which time the Underwood bill has been in operation, the full period of its operation down to the 1st of November—it was impossible to secure complete returns for November—and I find that in that period, under the Underwood bill, we imported \$2,014,088,333 worth of foreign goods. I have also looked up the figures of imports for the last 13 months of the Payne tariff, the 13 months immediately preceding the first 13 months of the Underwood bill, and I find that in that period we imported under the Payne bill \$1,957,382,892 worth of foreign goods. In other words, we had an increase, an excess of imports in the first 13 months under the Underwood bill over the last 13 months of the Payne bill amounting to \$56,705,441. So there is no necessity of unusual and crippling parsimony based on a reduction of imports. There is no reduction but an increase of imports. There is no necessity for a war tax based on a reduction of imports, for imports have increased, in spite of the war, \$56,000,000 over a like period before the passage of the Underwood bill.

Mr. FESS. Did the gentleman notice whether the imports in these war months of this year are greater or as great as the corresponding months of the last year before the war?

Mr. MONDELL. The imports during August and September, 1914, were lower than the imports of the corresponding months of the year before, but the imports prior to the war were greater than the corresponding months of the year before, and now we have reached a condition under which the imports are increasing constantly, in spite of the war. The imports for October, 1914, were over \$138,000,000, whereas for October, 1913, they were less than \$133,000,000, or an increase of over five and one-half millions.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. PLATT. I wanted to bring that out, and that is the fact, that there was an increase of almost \$6,000,000 in spite of the fact of the war.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; as between October, 1913, and October, 1914.

Mr. PLATT. In spite of the fact that October, 1913, was the first month after the passage of the tariff bill.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true.

Mr. PLATT. What effect has the war had over importations during the war months?

Mr. MONDELL. I will insert the table in the RECORD, from which you can secure that information.

The table is as follows:

Comparative statement of imports and duty collected during the 13 months from October, 1913, to October, 1914, inclusive, and during the preceding 13 months, September, 1912, to September, 1913, inclusive.

[Compiled from tables of imports of merchandise by months, Monthly Summary of Finance and Commerce, Department of Commerce.]

	Imports.	Revenue.		Imports.	Revenue.
1913.			1912.		
October.....	\$132,878,896	\$30,138,049	September.....	\$144,819,493	\$27,475,127
November.....	148,216,536	21,173,628	October.....	177,987,986	30,216,824
December.....	184,587,571	21,510,140	November.....	153,094,898	25,666,353
1914.			1913.		
January.....	154,418,247	23,528,080	January.....	163,063,438	29,334,124
February.....	147,973,376	17,609,604	February.....	149,913,918	27,605,116
March.....	182,762,954	25,927,213	March.....	155,445,498	27,457,489
April.....	173,896,476	22,232,766	April.....	146,194,461	23,693,967
May.....	164,209,515	20,800,573	May.....	133,723,713	20,434,749
June.....	157,529,450	23,533,448	June.....	131,245,877	23,608,599
July.....	159,677,291	22,988,465	July.....	139,061,770	27,806,655
August.....	129,767,890	19,431,363	August.....	137,651,553	30,934,952
September.....	140,089,611	17,225,887	September.....	171,084,843	26,794,494
October.....	138,080,520	16,271,829	Total.....	1,957,382,892	345,276,610
Total.....	2,014,088,333	282,571,045	1913-14.....		282,571,045
1912-13.....	1,957,382,892		Decrease in revenue, 1913-14.....		62,705,565
Excess imports, 1913-14.....	56,705,441				

NOTE.—Imports for September, 1913, include a approximately \$13,665,000 entered during the first 3 days of October under the tariff law of 1909.

Mr. MONDELL. The fact is the Underwood bill was intended to largely increase imports, and it has largely increased imports in spite of the war, and, whether the war continues or not, the imports over those of the Payne bill will be increased, and when the war ceases no man knows the amount of foreign goods that will be dumped on our shores.

Mr. FESS. Is it not a fact—

Mr. MONDELL. The fact is that the difficulty is not in decreased importations but in the fact that many articles were placed on the free list, and the duty on other articles was reduced to such an extent that with increased importations in the first 13 months of the Underwood bill of more than \$56,000,000 there was a decrease in revenues in the same period of \$62,705,565.

Mr. FESS. In other words, the war has not decreased importations sufficiently to necessitate a war tax, because the importations under the war are greater than the importations prior to the war—

Mr. MONDELL. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman give me five minutes more?

Mr. DAVIS. I will start the gentleman out with four minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. The war tax was not necessary because of any reduction of imports. That is very clear. There has been an increase of importations for eight months prior to the passage of the war tax over the preceding eight months. The war tax was necessitated, as I said on the floor of the House some time ago, not by reason of the war in Europe but by reason of the Democratic war on sound fiscal and financial principles and policies. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. COOPER. Do not the increases which the gentleman has given as to importations under the Underwood law and the Payne law afford an absolute demonstration of the fact that the Underwood tariff law as a revenue producer was a demonstrated failure before war began, and that if there had not been a war that law must of necessity have been amended or there would have been a tax anyway?

Mr. MONDELL. That was thoroughly and abundantly demonstrated before the war began. The war was the excuse, the opportunity of the Democratic Party to get out of a hole in which its bad management had placed it and the country along with it. [Applause on the Republican side.] And it was very clear then that the bill would have to be amended, and it grows clearer every day.

Mr. SLOAN. Was not the passage of the war-revenue bill here a confession of the failure of the Underwood tariff law as a revenue producer?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, unquestionably, and while it failed as a revenue producer the only thing that prevents a general flood-

ing of our markets with enormously increased importations of foreign goods is the situation created by the war.

In spite of war abroad importations have increased, are constantly increasing, to the detriment of the American people, and there is a constant loss to the American Treasury by reason of the reduction in the rate of customs duties. It is now apparent that whoever shall be in control of Congress after the close of the European war it will be necessary to revise the tariff, in order to secure adequate revenue and prevent the complete overthrow of industries by a flood of foreign goods. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me just one minute? I wish to yield that minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take that much time. When I went home I met my people on the cotton situation, and I want to ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] is recognized.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it is perhaps not inappropriate that we should discuss national defense upon a District of Columbia bill. It was 100 years ago the 24th of last August when a small force of about 5,000 British put our raw levies to flight at Bladensburg and came here and burned the National Capitol.

I do not believe in war. But war comes like a bolt from the blue. It is not enough that our people have always wanted peace. Some unforeseen occurrence, like the shot at Lexington or the shots at the Chesapeake or the massacre at the Alamo or the destruction of the *Maine* or the first shot at Fort Sumter brings war before we expect it.

We pray for peace; but if war comes we shall not have time to gather supplies and create armies as we did in 1861 and in 1898. We should be prepared.

It was one of the main objects of the Constitution, as therein stated, "to secure domestic tranquillity" and "to provide for the common defense." The two go together. Unless we provide for the common defense we are the temptation of every rapacious or irritable nation, and peace will be a dream only.

Now, I am going to speak mostly of our defenses on land. I was on the Committee on Military Affairs for some 10 years. On land, as on sea, real defense lies in the mobile forces that can attack—in speedy ships with high-power guns on the water and in men with rifles in their hands that they know how to use, like Gen. Jackson's frontiersmen, on the land. An army of sharpshooters is our real defense. Forts and slow-moving naval fortresses may be out of date, but the man behind the gun is

never out of date. [Applause.] The fathers of the Constitution understood this well. They passed a militia bill in the First Congress which enacted that every man between 18 and 45 years of age was to appear at an annual muster provided with a musket, a horn of powder, and bullets. They were not satisfied, as our present authorities are, with, at the most, 1,100,000 rifles in hand when we have 16,000,000 men that may be called on in time of war.

Even before that first militia bill a small school for officers had been established. The new Nation was surrounded by the colonies of the then great powers; Spain, England, and France owned these colonies and were aggressive. Are we in any better position to-day? The ocean that then separated us by weeks from the other side has now become the speediest and best means of transportation, and we are now even nearer than then to the great military powers.

That militia bill provided for a reserve of arms and men, and the fathers of our country also provided a small standing army. They had, in 1792, an army of 5,000 men. Our population at that time, besides 700,000 slaves, was only 3,300,000 freemen. Our free population has increased thirtyfold. If we now had a standing army in the same proportion to population, we should have 150,000 men instead of 75,000.

I stand by the principles of our forefathers. Our Army should be in the proportion that they established. I believe they had about the right number for a standing army. It was not a large army. Our Army is a school of arms, a college of military information and progress. For its size, ours is the best army in the world, because both the horse and foot are an army of sharpshooters, and no other army in the world can claim that.

But the fathers of our country did not depend on this organized army. They put their trust and dependence in the reserves, or what we call the volunteers—in a whole people that would spring to arms at their country's call. And we do this also, and rightly. No standing army can be great enough to carry on a great war. We had millions, North and South, in the Civil War, which put 4,000,000 men in arms. Ten millions or more are now engaged in the European conflict. But in peace no nation can afford to put its whole male able-bodied population in the army. Germany enlists less than one-half of her available recruits for two years, and less than one-half of her men have been trained in arms. Including not only those who are with the colors, but also the landwehr, or reserve, and the landsturm, or home guard, Germany's trained men number about five and a half millions. We do not hear that there are arms or equipment for more, or of their putting their 11,000,000 able-bodied men in arms, nor have they put any such number in the field. No other nation puts so many in the army as Germany. The tax is too terrible. The American Army costs on the average \$1,000 a man per year. It costs still more to take those same men from the community and from productive pursuits. A standing army here of a million men would cost a thousand million dollars a year, and the cost is prohibitive.

But we can make provision for arms as they did in the militia bill of old times, for ammunition, equipment, and educated officers at one-fortieth of this cost, even if arms and equipment have to be entirely renewed every 10 years. The sum that will support 25,000 men in the Army will in 10 years make full provision of arms and equipment for a million men. If it is used only for arms—that is, for rifles, artillery, and gun carriages—it will in 2 years make provision for more than a million men, and would in 10 years make provision for five million men.

If we can rely upon our factories in case of emergency to supply most of the clothes, harness, wagon work, ammunition, and shoes, as we may fairly do, so that we need only put arms and part of the other material in store, we can, with the same sum or at the cost of 25,000 men, put rifles, field cannon, and gun carriages in store sufficient for 5,000,000 men within 10 years, and we can do this without withdrawing a single man from work or wages and without establishing the least show of militarism.

This is the system that was adopted by our forefathers. It is the way also by which a population of 250,000 Boers in South Africa—by providing for the common defense and having cannon, rifles, and ammunition—held Great Britain at bay with her 250,000,000 of population and her standing army of over 300,000 troops. It is the only way to provide national defense at reasonable cost.

After all, standing armies are trifles in time of war. The first necessity will be that of arms. It is an open secret that just at the present time the English forces can not go to the Continent because England has not arms with which to equip them. I know this also from private advices. France has been

holding back her levies because she can not fully equip them. Arms are a necessity, and it takes months and years to provide them. Our factories are now glutted with foreign orders which they can not fill until after months or years of delay in building machinery to manufacture military rifles. Arms can not be provided immediately.

The new Springfield rifles cost \$15 apiece, and a stock of them can be accumulated in 10 years at an annual cost of \$1.50 for each rifle. Fifteen million dollars a year will give us 10,000,000 Springfields within 10 years, or enough to put rifles into the hands of 10,000,000 men if some great military power should attempt to invade us. I grant that no such storm cloud threatens now, but who dares warrant the chances of the next 10 years, unless we make for peace by having a rifle ready for the hands of every man as did our forefathers. We are not entitled to call for volunteers unless we can arm them.

Now, about 16 years ago, in the Military Affairs Committee, just at the outbreak of the Spanish War, I found that we had just enough repeating rifles to put in the hands of our Regulars and only old Springfields for our Volunteers. At my instance and with the aid of the War Department we finally increased the appropriation for making rifles from some \$350,000 to \$1,700,000, which supplied 100,000 rifles a year. Now they have gradually reduced that sum, because we have 300,000 Krags and 700,000 Springfield rifles on hand, or thereabouts (I get these figures from the appropriations which tell about what we have made), and they only estimate for \$250,000 this year, which is about enough to give 16,000 rifles, or only sufficient to take care of ordinary wear and tear. We ought to put rifles in reserve for time of necessity. The War Department publications show plans for increasing the Regular Army to 120,000 and the militia to 150,000 and for volunteers to make up a first line of about 500,000, and they are making all their plans for supplying this first line only with arms and equipment. This is not right. We need supplies in store for the second and third lines as well, so that if we happen to be forced into war the whole citizen soldiery can have arms with which to fight. [Applause.]

Our Government factories can make 1,500 rifles a day, with two shifts; or, with three shifts and working every day in the year, they could make 2,200 a day or 750,000 in a year. But what is that if we get into war? Modern war is a matter of days and weeks, at most; of months, and not of years. It will take over 10 years to get our men supplied with Springfield rifles, at \$1.50 per year per man. It will make for peace to have a stock of arms ready to put into the hands of our citizen soldiery. They cost little.

The machine guns, using the same ammunition, cost about \$515 apiece. Four are now allotted to 1,000 men, and if that ratio continues \$2.30 a man would provide the gun, or, on the 10-year basis, it is 23 cents per man per year.

The 3-inch field gun costs less than \$5,000 for the gun and carriage proper, and, allowing a battery of four guns to 1,000 men, each man can be provided with these essentials of the field artillery at a cost of \$20, or, on the 10-year basis, \$2 a year.

The evidence taken last Tuesday shows that we have only enough field artillery for 300,000 men. The department only expects to provide 1,290 guns in all, or enough for 450,000 men. Guns and carriages can not be made in haste. Of all things that take time, artillery takes the most, and we should provide it lavishly and have it in store. This will not be done in order to have war, but in order to avoid war and keep the peace. We should see that the aggressive nations, who look greedily upon our lands and wealth, should know that we have arms and artillery for our millions and not merely for a first line.

Small arms at \$15, quick firers at \$2.30 per man, and field guns at \$20 a man, a total of \$37.30, can be provided for a million men for \$37,300,000.

I am in hopes that this is all that we need to keep in store. Perhaps ammunition, clothes, shoes, harness, and equipment can be left, for the most part, to be made by our various factories in times of emergency. But if not, the total cost of full equipment for each man for artillery, ammunition, arms, and necessary equipment is something under \$225, so that \$22,500,000 a year would give full equipment for 1,000,000 men in 10 years.

I add a memorandum of this equipment, Mr. Chairman, which I submit, as follows:

MEMORANDUM—ARMY EQUIPMENT.

A rifle costs \$14.50 to	\$15.00
(It was \$12.50 a few years ago, but before that was \$17.)	
There are 100 rounds in the belt, 120 in the combat train, 120 in the ammunition train, making 340. A like amount ought to be held in reserve, or, in all 680 rounds, which cost \$27 per 1,000, or about	18.00
(At private factories the cost is \$35 a thousand.)	
Machine guns cost about \$515 apiece, and each should have 21,000 rounds of ammunition, making altogether about \$1,100. Four machine guns are allowed to 1,000 men, making \$4,400, or, for each man—	4.40

As to field guns, a little over 3 are allowed to 1,000 men. The battery of four 3-inch field guns, with limbers, caissons, harness, and every appurtenance except horses, will cost between \$70,000 and \$71,000. As to ammunition, they wish 1,800 rounds for each gun, making \$72,000. The large 6-inch gun batteries cost nearly or quite double as much, but there will be comparatively few of these, and we might average the cost, therefore, by allowing the cost of four 3-inch guns to 1,000 men, which, with the horses, would be \$150,000, or, per man-----\$150.00

The uniform, army shoes, and other essentials (like socks and underclothing) which could not be furnished by purchase in market without being especially ordered, amount, per man, to not over-----30.00

The total cost of equipment, per man, for artillery, arms, ammunition, and necessary equipment-----217.40

I am talking no secrets. All this is in the pamphlet issued as to organization.

Twenty-two dollars a man for 10 years would provide all that he needs of arms, artillery, and equipment. Is it too much to provide all this for a million men?

I prefer to provide arms alone for 5,000,000 men and to leave the manufacture of the rest of the equipment to the manufacturing power of the United States when we need it.

You will ask me whether our citizen soldiers will have training. If you have plenty of arms you can issue them lavishly to every school that desires them, under proper regulations to be adopted by the Secretary of War. Examinations should be arranged, and every schoolboy who has qualified as a marksman or sharpshooter and knows how to take his gun to pieces and put it together again should receive some prize. Men in the community who have received this education would be almost soldiers, ready, if they have learned to obey orders, to make marches and to shoot straight. Target practice at short ranges, with a diminished target, can be had against any railroad embankment. It is no matter of great expense, and will provide trained recruits for expansion of the Regular Army and National Guard in time of need, as well as for volunteers.

But some one will say, "But what of officers?" We want qualified officers, scattered through the community as they were in 1848 and 1861, when West Point graduates from civil life furnished almost the greater part of our successful commanders. We are neglecting the training of officers.

Our Military Academy has not grown with our population. In 1812 it had 250 cadets, and our population was less than 7,500,000, including slaves. We have now over thirteen times as many people. If we had the same proportion at the academy now it would be a school of over 3,300 young men instead of less than 700. That school is not able now to supply the needs of the Army. Before 1860 a large majority of the graduates went into civil life. Every graduate of the four-year course in civil life can be expected to remain available for the Volunteer Army for 30 years thereafter, and every cadet in the academy will thus represent eight officers who will be ready for volunteer service. If there be one West Point graduate allotted for every hundred men, they would be pretty well supplied; and if each West Point cadetship thus supplied 8 officers to 800 men, the annual cost of, say, \$1,600 for a cadet—it is rather high—makes the cost for officers about \$2 a year for each man that they command. It is a small price.

These graduates would no doubt take an interest in the National Guard and improve it greatly.

The men in civil life who had been educated in West Point were the greatest asset that the United States had in the Mexican War and in the Civil War. These graduates were specially equipped to help in time of war, and the work done by our armies in 1848 and 1861 was not like that of 1812, because we had many officers who were trained and competent.

What is the cost?

They are the cheapest investment that we ever made. A West Point (or several military academies) educating 3,300 men would in time provide an officer to every hundred men, or an army of two and a half million men.

It would take time to obtain this supply, and meanwhile we might well establish some system by which prizes could be offered to graduates of a scientific course, who should also stand a thorough examination in military science. We might establish a system of military cadets in the Army. We had it once. The Germans have it now in their one-year men, who are graduates of colleges.

We want men who will lead our forces in time of war and who in time of peace will serve their country by adding to the efficiency of the militia.

Our strength lies in the people, not in standing armies. It lies in defense and not in attack. It lies in peace and not in war. But we can only keep peace if we have a people who are not only numerous but who are provided with arms as well as with trained officers, and who from youth up know how to obey

orders, march together, and shoot straight, because they have learned it in school.

Such an army would be invincible, for on the country's call its soldiers would spring up and be born like Minerva, fully armed and ready and equipped for war. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 2 hours and 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to spend a few minutes discussing this bill, and yet I think I realize that I would not be in order at this time unless I said a few things about war. [Laughter.]

I want to make my declaration now, so that you will all understand it, that I am for war; but it is for war against wrong and injustice, and not against my neighbors and friends. I am for civilization, I am opposed to barbarism, whether of nations or of individuals. It is a strange fact, as I review the history and conditions of the world, that as individuals men are largely civilized. The people of the world have made marvelous progress in civilization, but as nations we are just as barbarous as we were in the dark ages; we resort to the same methods to decide matters of right now as they did then, but as individuals we submit to the rule of right and justice.

What is civilization? I was sitting back here trying to analyze it, as my friend from Wyoming, Mr. MONDELL, was talking. Civilization is nothing more than a man surrendering the power to determine his own rights or to enforce them. I can not determine my own rights as a citizen. The community will not let me. After the right has been determined I can not go ahead and enforce it, for the community will not permit. I must surrender, in order to be a civilized man, both the power to determine my own rights and the power of enforcing them. The nations of the world will never become civilized until they surrender their right to determine for themselves the question of right, and providing a power and a means of enforcing it without the arbitrament of war.

To-day we are beholding the greatest spectacle that the world has ever seen, and what is it all about? What is the question to be determined? The question to be determined is whether or not Serbia was particeps criminis with a high-school boy who shot down the prince of Austria. That is the question involved. Austria wanted to go into Serbia and settle that question herself. Serbia wanted to settle it for herself, but neither of them was willing to submit to a high court of right and justice to determine that question. After we have seen 17,000,000 people in arms, after we have seen three or four million men stricken down, after we have seen thousands upon thousands of widows and orphans made, after we have seen blood flow like rivers, will there be any determination of the great question that lies at the base of this conflict, and that is whether Serbia was an accomplice in that transaction?

As I said, I am for war, but I am for war for right and not for war upon my neighbor. We have established a country here based not upon force, not upon power, but upon eternal right, and I undertake to say that as long as we do stand for right we will never be threatened by any other nation. I am for peace as between my neighbor and myself as to our mutual rights. You can not determine it by war. That determines only one question, and that is which is the stronger, and not which one is right. You never can determine a question of right by mere force. I know it is commonly said that might makes right. As to nations that is true, but as to individuals it is not true. But I see no reason why we should not have the same principles apply to national morals that apply to individual morals. No man would stand up and say to-day as to his civil rights that might makes right. As between men nobody would claim that, and yet good men, strong men, able men, stand up and advocate a theory that might makes right when you apply it to national morals.

I am not one of those who believe that we are in any danger. I never have become hysterical about the invasion of the yellow race, or any other race. We have lived on this portion of this little continent as a nation for a century and a quarter—125 years—and during all that time no nation has declared a war upon us, and no nation has undertaken to approach the offensive; no nation has ever, so far as authentic record goes, considered the question of making an invasion upon us. We have had two wars.

A MEMBER. Three.

Mr. PROUTY. Two wars outside of the one among ourselves, which I did not include.

Mr. KAHN. The Mexican and the Spanish Wars.

Mr. PROUTY. The Mexican War I had forgotten, and it ought to be forgotten. But no nation declared war on us. Great Britain did not declare war in 1812 and she would not do it now. Spain, with her armada, did not declare war upon the United States, and they would not now. Mexico will not declare war, nor will any other nation. All we need to do is to stay here, be men and be right, stand for high ideals, and we will have no trouble.

I agree with Abraham Lincoln when he said that all the armies and the navies of the world could not reach the Ohio River. I agree with that proposition. I have looked the thing over pretty carefully and I say that all the navies of the world could not enter the port of New York, even if there was not a battleship in New York Harbor. With our land batteries and our mines and other things all the navies of the world could not enter New York Harbor and approach New York City. There is no well-protected harbor that I know of—any approachable harbor—where they could come in.

In conversation with a gentleman back yonder a moment ago, he said that they would land their forces at some place where there was not any port. What does that mean? You can not land an armed vessel out in midocean. You can not land them where there are no ports. The very best they could do, if they could not get into any of these fortified harbors, would be to land at some place along the seacoast, and to do that they would have to anchor away out at sea and send their men in small vessels to the shore, by boats and skiffs, and so forth; and I undertake to say that all of the armies of the world could not land enough men on the shore so that our policemen would not be able to arrest them. [Laughter.]

Mr. PETERSON. They might come by aeroplane.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; but where are these hundred million people during this time? Suppose an army was to start now from Germany or France or England with a hundred thousand men on their transports—and that is a big amount to carry—and they would get down here at some place, and by our modern method of telegraphy we can tell where they are and what they are doing, by means of our scouts—suppose they would land there or would approach there to land, and then would get into their little boats to come to land, do you suppose one of them would ever get to shore? Why, talk about the Navy and the Army and all that—I can go down here into Arkansas, where the boys have been trained from youth to shoot out the eye of a squirrel, and get enough men to pick out every man before he got to shore. [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. What about the battleships that would be out there with the transports?

Mr. PLATT. How would you know just where they were going to land? There is a good deal of room on the ocean, as the German cruisers have shown.

Mr. PROUTY. I would have this wireless telegraphy, established from one end of this country to the other, tell us.

Mr. PLATT. But they will be on shore by that time.

Mr. PROUTY. Oh, no; they can not land 100,000 men in a minute.

Mr. PLATT. They do not need to land over 20,000 men to get 20 miles inland.

Mr. PROUTY. Twenty thousand men would not last a breakfast spell with the outraged citizenship of America. [Laughter.]

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. I would like to say to the gentleman that when we went down to Cuba it took us from 10 o'clock at night until daylight to land 1,000 men in those boats, exactly the way the gentleman is describing.

Mr. PROUTY. Of course. I am not so dizzy as you fellows think I am.

Mr. OGLESBY. And I want to add that there was nobody there to stop us.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Of course the gentleman does not pretend to say that civilians could begin to snipe troops and get away with it?

Mr. PROUTY. I undertake to say that we could call out the State militia of a State like Arkansas—and I am picking the smallest State in the Union, so far as the militia is concerned—where the boys are trained to shoot the eyes out of squirrels from their youth, and I would plant them down on one of these unprotected shores that you speak of and I guarantee that no German or English could land. [Laughter.] But I did not intend to make a war speech. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMS. Go ahead. You are doing very well.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The gentleman noticed that I spoke of Jackson's frontiersmen as being the best sort of a defense. An army of sharpshooters is the best army in the world; but we have not got it.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; I agree with that—except in Arkansas.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I wish we had them all over the country, just as you say they have them in Arkansas.

Mr. PROUTY. What I am trying to say is that I am in favor of an international court of arbitration to settle these questions and remove the tax burden that comes from settling them by war, and I want to say that it is time for the American people, as well as other people, to consider these great questions from the standpoint of the men who furnish the money and the blood to conduct wars, rather than from the standpoint of the men who owe their whole career and everything they have to the art of war. I think it is time for us to consider the orphans, the children, and the mothers of this country as well as the fellow who wants to wear epaulets.

Mr. Chairman, I now want to talk about something that is just as warlike, if we can judge from the newspapers, as this is, and that is the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. If you will allow your minds to calm down a little bit, I will try and bring mine down and call your attention to a real situation. You all know that it has been said ever since I have been in Congress, especially since I have been upon the District Committee, that I am a fellow who is constantly stirring up things and causing a great deal of trouble to this District.

If you will look through what I have said from time to time, you will find that I have never advocated anything except the purest, simplest justice as between the people of this District and the rest of the people of the United States. With that kind of preface, I want to call your attention to a real situation. If you will turn to the last page of this appropriation bill, you will find that it appropriates eleven million three hundred and two thousand dollars and odd; and if you will turn to the report of the District Commissioners, just filed, and of which I see my friend MONDELL has a copy, you will find that the revenues of the District of Columbia last year amounted to \$7,321,000, independent of a million and a half dollars that came in under special levies or taxation. We have had in this District for more than a quarter of a century a plan by which the District furnishes a dollar—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Over a third of a century.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; over a third of a century—a plan by which the District furnishes a dollar and the people of the United States furnish a dollar. Since the District of Columbia has \$7,321,000 as their part, to match that the United States must put up \$7,321,000 on their part; otherwise you would destroy the symmetry of that sacred hallowed thing called the half-and-half principle.

Now, you will notice that if that were done that the District of Columbia appropriation bill ought to provide for the expenditure of, say, in round numbers, \$15,000,000. As a matter of fact, they only find it necessary to expend \$11,000,000, and while I am discussing that phase of it I want to call attention to the fact that even of that item there are \$128,000 that ought not to be included. There are \$128,000 appropriated in this bill for expenses of the water works which is provided for out of an entirely different fund, so you should take \$128,000 from the figures which I am using, because that ought not to have been included in the sum total of those figures because that does not come out of the general revenues of the District or the United States, but comes out of what is known as the water fund. Now, the result of this, just figured coolly and calmly as if you were on a board of supervisors or an alderman in the city, you would say, What are we going to do about this? We have \$2,000,000 surplus revenue. You would say one of two things: Either we would cut down the amount of the revenues to be derived or we would increase the appropriation. You would not leave a couple of million dollars of unexpended money knowing it was going to increase in the future rather than diminish, because every man who has studied this problem knows the revenues even on the present—I was going to say "sham"—basis are going to increase. There is no question about that, the commissioners so say, and everybody who has studied the question knows it is true. It is not only this year, but it is going to increase and next year it will be eight and a half or nine million dollars.

Mr. SIMS. And that is without increasing the rate of taxation?

Mr. PROUTY. Oh, yes; I am not discussing that question just now. Now, the American Congress, sitting as I feel we are, as just an arbiter between the people of the United States and the District of Columbia, should do something. Now, what shall it be? Well, some, I suppose, will say we ought to cut down the

taxes in the District of Columbia. I suppose that is really what they mean. But, on the other hand, I do not believe there is a man in this Congress who has got the nerve, in view of the record of the facts in this case, to get up on the floor of this House and state that he believes that the people of the District of Columbia ought to have their taxes reduced. What are the simple facts? I will not go into them at length, but what are the simple facts? They are that they pay now 10 mills on the dollar on actual value of real estate. Under the organic act, about which they have said so much, it was provided it should be 15 mills, but now they pay 10 mills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. PROUTY. I should like a little more time.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. PROUTY. As I say, they pay 10 mills on the dollar on real estate. I undertake to say, after having spent three years investigating that question, there is not a city in the United States of any size that does not pay a good deal more than that. You can but recall your own taxes at home. I have compiled, as you all know, the taxes of all cities of any size in the United States, based upon actual value, not upon assessed value, and the law provides upon actual value, and the average in the United States is a little over 19 mills. Therefore I say I do not believe any man has the hardihood to stand on the floor of the House and say to all the people of this Nation that the people of the District of Columbia ought to have their taxes still further reduced.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PROUTY. With pleasure.

Mr. CRISP. I just want to ask the gentleman if it is not also true that intangible personal property and articles of adornment are also exempt from taxes here, which does not apply elsewhere?

Mr. PROUTY. Well, half of that proposition is true. Moneys and credits are not assessed here at all. Congress did a few years ago correct that provision of 1892 in regard to wearing apparel—that is, articles of personal adornment. Now, I am not going to discuss the question of whether property is assessed here at the full value—that is, based upon the two-thirds proposition. I am not going to discuss that because I have not the time, but I will say in a general way from all the information I can obtain, and I have sought it honestly, because I hold no grudge against these people, they have been splendid to me personally, and I have no grudge against them, but I have been probing for the facts, and I find that property in the District of Columbia is assessed lower on the basis of the law—that is, two-thirds—than it is generally in other cities. There is no dispute about the proposition that property in the city of Washington instead of being assessed at two-thirds is only assessed one-third. Of course there are isolated cases where that does not apply, but take it as a whole; and a committee of this Congress filed their report after giving a most elaborate study of the question covering a period of more than two years of time. Then, as has been suggested, moneys and credits are not assessed at all here. Men can come here with their millions and tens of millions and twenty million dollars, as they have, and escape taxation at home and escape taxation here. Well, I am not now discussing that part of the question, but I want to say it is unfair to the people of the United States that men can take up a technical residence in the city of Washington and escape taxation at home and thereby defraud their people at home and at the same time give no benefit to the people of the District of Columbia. So I pass that proposition. I do not believe there is anybody going to get up here and say that we are in favor of reduced taxation.

Now, what are you going to do with that \$3,000,000 next year, \$4,000,000 the next year, and \$5,000,000 the next year, assuming there is to be no change in the manner of assessment and no different rate? What are you going to do with it? Oh, give it back to the District and go out into my district and your district and levy a war tax to make the deficit good. I have seen a good deal of effort about here to find money to be economical on, and we are told we have not money enough with which to run this Government, and yet here are \$2,000,000 that you are going to hand back to people who are the wealthiest people per capita of any people in the United States, and go out to our people to get the money to make it good. Now, is it not absolutely fair to say that these people themselves ought to use the money that they themselves are able to put up on an equitable, generous basis before they ask my people to contribute? These people are educating their children here by paying half taxation, and our people pay full taxation and then

contribute half to the people down here. My people are getting no richer than these people here; my people have no greater revenues per capita than these people have here, and yet all this time we are paying out for my people money to support these people. Of course, some people, somehow or another, get charmed and fascinated, like a snake fascinates a bird, when they get among these people here and listen to their stories. I admit I do not get fascinated in that way. I want to determine but one question, and that is the question of what is right between my people and these people here.

Now, while I am on my feet, I will say that an amendment will be offered by my friend, Mr. JOHNSON, chairman of our committee, providing that the funds collected from the District of Columbia shall be used to pay the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, so far as they go, and that whatever is necessary beyond that shall be paid out of the Public Treasury. Is not that fair? If they collect money by a very low rate of taxation, more than equal their half, is it anything unjust or unfair to say that they shall use the rest of that money for themselves before they go out among other people in order to collect money to make that good?

And then another thing that I expect will be suggested: When the organic law was enacted all of you who are familiar with that will remember a committee spent nearly four years in investigating the question of relations between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. They considered very carefully the question as to what was a fair rate of taxation to be put upon these people. The distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. Allison, was chairman of that committee, and after making an examination of the tax rate in cities of the United States they found a 15-mill tax, or \$1.50 a hundred, was a reasonable and average tax, and therefore in the organic act it was fixed at 15 mills on the dollar, or \$1.50 on the hundred, actual value. That continued for 22 years, but in 1902, when they found they were getting more revenues than were necessary for the District's half, some fascination got hold of Members of Congress, which I have never been able to comprehend, by which they reduced the revenues for the District rather than reduce the part that was contributed by the United States, and they said, rather than be assessed at its full value, it should be assessed at only one-third value. So that real estate in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia is now only paying 10 mills on the actual value, while in my city and in your city it is 20 mills or more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. There will be an amendment striking out that two-thirds clause and leaving it as it was originally, and then there will be another amendment offered here striking out the word "tangible."

In the original act all property in the District of Columbia—I mean all kinds of property—was assessable. Moneys and credits were assessable for more than 20 years in the District of Columbia. But at the same time that this other law was passed they put in the words "tangible property," which had the effect of relieving personal property, in the form of moneys and credits, from taxation.

Now, there will be a little amendment offered here proposing just to strike out the word "tangible" and leave the act just as it was when Congress passed it after such an enormous and studied investigation. As I have already intimated, there can be no justice in allowing a man like C. W. Post to come down here from Battle Creek, Mich., and make a tentative residence in your city by buying a little house which did not cost more than \$9,000. It was valued at \$9,700, I believe. He put in it a little of his old household furniture from Battle Creek, Mich. He lived in Battle Creek, Mich., in magnificent style for 22 years, and, so far as I know, never lived in the city of Washington in the last 20 years except when he was visiting here and stopped at the New Willard Hotel. When his will was filed for probate it was found that he had declared that he was a citizen of Washington, and the will and the report in connection with it shows that he had pretty nearly \$20,000,000 of moneys and credits. During all that time Michigan had been trying to get some taxes from him, and they have a case now pending in the court where they are trying to enforce the payment of some tax. But he came here, and under the peculiarity of our law exempting moneys and credits from taxation, he claimed a technical residence here, so that he might escape taxation both here and at home. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is left on either side?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty minutes' time is left on the gentleman's side.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The time is exhausted on the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. It is exhausted on the other side.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not going to consume the full 50 minutes that remain in this general debate, and the time that I shall consume will be upon the bill that is under consideration. I shall not undertake to discuss the question of whether or not the United States is adequately prepared for all the emergencies that might, in the minds of men who are looking into the future, arise. I am very much more concerned with the appropriation bill that is under consideration at this time.

The current law making appropriations for the District of Columbia appropriated \$12,771,054.23 for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1915. The bill now under consideration, as reported by the committee to the House, carries \$11,303,048.45, or \$969,611.04 less than the current law. The estimates made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as to the taxes, as to the available amount derived from taxes and other sources in the District of Columbia for 1916, amount to a little less than \$8,000,000. The estimates that they submitted in the annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1916 were, in round numbers, \$12,771,000, so that the appropriation in the bill now reported to the House is \$1,596,860.78 below the estimates submitted to the Congress.

The committee, in submitting this bill to the House, believes that it has recommended a sufficient amount of money for the proper conduct of the affairs of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1916. We have had in mind, of course, the fact that we must economize at this time, if at any time at all, in the appropriation of the public money. There were matters submitted in the estimates to the committee for new enterprises, for new projects, that did not appeal to us as being of enough importance to warrant now the appropriation for which they asked.

I have no doubt, judging the future from the past, that before this bill becomes a law the amount that it carries will be increased above the amount that has been reported to the House; and yet I am not willing to concede that it is necessary that a single dollar should be added to it, so far as the necessities of the administration of the affairs in the District are concerned.

We have tried to take care of all the District enterprises. We have increased in this bill, practically in the amounts that were submitted to us by the commissioners, the various sums for the conduct of the schools and the police department, but not for the street-extension department, because, I think, no committee has ever appropriated for the full amount asked by the commissioners for the improvement of streets. We did not in this bill, because your committee very seriously doubted whether the commissioners could, within the fiscal year, wisely expend the amount for which they asked.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has any provision been made for rebuilding the destroyed Western High School?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, of all the gentlemen upon the floor of the House I would say that I thought my friend from Wisconsin kept up with the matter of appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I try to, and I think there was an item carried for that purpose last year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes. The deficiency bill passed at the last session of Congress carried an item, according to my recollection, of \$150,000 for the reconstruction of the Western High School, which was destroyed by fire, and I understand that contracts have now been let for the beginning of that work. There was an estimate submitted for this bill asking an appropriation of \$50,000 for the furnishing of the Western High School. I might as well at this time, since the subject has

been mentioned, as well as later, in explanation why it is not carried in this bill, say that the appropriation for the reconstruction of the Western High School having been carried in a deficiency bill, the committee, after carefully considering the matter, decided that the \$50,000 for its furnishing should also be carried in a deficiency bill at this session of Congress. So it is not a disposition on the part of the Appropriations Committee or the subcommittee preparing the bill to deny the amount asked for to furnish the Western High School; that is not the reason that it was not included in this bill, but merely in the interest of keeping appropriations somewhat straight that we have let it go over, to also be reported in a deficiency bill.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to ask the gentleman some questions about the department of education. Does the gentleman care to go into that now?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I had just as lief go into it now as at any time.

Mr. MOORE. Several memorials from colored residents of the District of Columbia have been handed to me, mainly predicated upon an article in the Washington Sun, which appears to be an organ of the colored people, complaining of conditions in the schools in the city of Washington. The Washington Sun has an article which appears to be a report of a committee of what is known as the Oldest Inhabitants' Association of Washington, and it has these rather startling headlines:

Horrible conditions of Washington schools—Report of committee appointed by president says dissatisfaction is widespread in schools.

The memorials all seem to indicate that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the conduct of colored schools, that there is a reason for the complaint in regard to rating of children, and a general dissatisfaction. I would like to know if the committee has any information on this subject.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman a thing that he knows perfectly well, that the committee reporting this bill has no jurisdiction over matters of legislation. It is only concerned in the matter of appropriation. There has been no complaint made to the subcommittee over which I preside concerning any misappropriation of any of the funds made in the bill for the schools of the District. But, in addition to that, since the gentleman has asked the question, and while it is not a matter that immediately concerns the provisions carried in this bill, I will say, although I have not seen the paper that he reads from, that I have heard and have had statements made to me by colored people who are reliable, in my judgment, and who are greatly interested in the school system, complaining bitterly of the management of the schools in the city of Washington; that injustice is frequently done by a lack of appropriate grading and classification. There have been statements made that there is great dissatisfaction in the management and conduct of the schools of the city of Washington. To my mind there is reason for these complaints.

I want to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as well as the members of this committee, that there is a condition existing in the city of Washington touching the administration of school affairs that, I dare say, does not exist in any other city in the United States or on the globe.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. These conditions concerning the colored schools are not due to a lack of appropriation but a lack of management, or mismanagement.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, not at all. It is entirely an administration matter and not of appropriation.

Mr. MOORE. It seemed to me that this was the proper place to bring up the question.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I want to say that there is a condition of administration in connection with the schools of the city of Washington that, so far as my knowledge goes, does not exist anywhere else on earth, and that the law itself is responsible, in my judgment, for the lack of proper administration.

Some of you, and perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will remember that in 1906 we enacted a school law for the District of Columbia. It is generally known as the longevity law, a law that provides for additional pay for teachers merely upon service. I shall have more to say about that a little further on. This same act provided for the organization of a school board in the District of Columbia. But, strange to say, it places the appointment of a school board in the District of Columbia in the hands of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. The result is that we have a board of education administering the affairs of the city of Washington that is not answerable to the Commissioners of the District of Colum-

bila, and who are not answerable or responsible to the Congress of the United States. They are answerable to the people who appoint them, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, composed of estimable gentlemen appointed for life. Now, if anybody expects a satisfactory administration of school affairs under that state of things, he expects the impossible.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Who makes the grading of which complaint is made? Is not that made by the teachers?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It is made by the teachers.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Should not the complaint be made to the teachers through the superintendent who has the power to correct it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The superintendent has not the power to correct it except by sanction of the school board appointed by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. They have absolute management even of the detail of the school affairs of the District of Columbia and absolute control over the superintendent, even to his election.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This has nothing whatever to do with the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Absolutely nothing.

Mr. SLAYDEN. But it has raised a very interesting question, and I would like to know what is the injustice in grading. Why should teachers have an animus that would incline them to do an injustice in a simple step in the administration of their schools?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman will have to address that inquiry to some one else, because I can not imagine why they should.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Are there negro teachers in these negro schools?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There are.

Mr. SLAYDEN. They certainly would not want to do an injustice to the people of their own race?

Mr. MOORE. I think the difference is really between the colored people themselves.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. May I take advantage of the gentleman's time just to insert one memorial that is before me?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If it does not take too long.

Mr. MOORE. It is as follows:

MEMORIAL OF COLORED CITIZENS OF WASHINGTON, D. C., INVITING THE ATTENTION OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE VERY DEPLORABLE CONDITION EXISTING IN THE COLORED BRANCH OF THE WASHINGTON, D. C., SCHOOL SYSTEM.

To the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, citizens of Washington, D. C., credibly informed of the bad conditions in our schools through the report of the school committee of the Oldest Inhabitants' Association (colored) of Washington, D. C., beg to invite through the disclosures of said report the attention of Congress to the very deplorable condition existing in the colored schools of Washington and which the school authorities have during the last five months continued to ignore, though the same has been called to their attention by your memorialists on more than one occasion, and also by the President of the United States, who referred to said board of education October 17, 1914, a copy of said report laid before him.

Your memorialists having vainly sought during the last four months to induce the superintendent of the schools of Washington, D. C., to take cognizance of the self-confessed delinquencies in the rating of the students in Normal School No. 2, and the continuance of said teacher on the pay roll, do now appeal to the Congress of the United States to investigate conditions in the colored branch of the Washington school system as indicated in said report, and grant your memorialists such relief as may seem proper.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL H. JEFFERSON.
JOHN WILLIAMS.
HENRY TUDY.
OSCAR H. SMITH.
BLANCHÉ THOMAS.
EUPHRASIE F. JONES.
ALFRED T. JONES.

That would seem to indicate that appeals to the superintendent are in vain. Of course these memorials are asking for an investigation by Congress. I do not know whether we want to embark on such an investigation, and I was bringing the matter to the attention of the gentleman who has charge of the appropriations to see whether he can throw any light on the subject toward obtaining relief for these memorialists.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman in that connection that when we reach the proper place in the bill—and it was not incorporated in the bill, and I did not seek to incorporate it during the time we were formulating the bill or before it was reported from the committee, because I did not really have the time to do it—it is my purpose to offer an amendment not to investigate this one particular instance to which the gentleman has reference, but for a complete survey of the organization and administration of the school

affairs of the District of Columbia, and I shall ask, of course, for a small appropriation in order that this may be done, in order that a report may be made to the Congress of the United States, in the hope that out of an investigation of this sort and a report made by an impartial tribunal we may be able by legislation to so reorganize the administration of the school affairs of this District that equity and justice may be administered to every citizen interested in these schools.

Mr. MOORE. Then we may discuss the matter further during the five-minute rule?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask the gentleman one further question, and he need not answer this question if his mind is not made up on the subject? Is it the gentleman's judgment that the administration of the school system should be under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia rather than of the supreme court?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have no hesitancy in the world in answering the gentleman. I do.

Mr. MOORE. That is, the members of the board of education should be appointed by the Commissioners of the District?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think so, unquestionably.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I am very much interested in his discussion of this question, and also his proposition to investigate it. I remember very well when this change was made, during a wave of reform that passed over the House. Nothing could stop it, because some gentlemen had some difficulty with the members of the old school board as it then existed, and it was claimed that everything was to be happy and lovely if they could get these appointments made by the supreme court. It seemed to me at the time that the members of the Supreme Court of the District were the last persons in the world to make these appointments, and while some of us fought it and voted against it, yet the reform, so called, prevailed.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad, indeed, to know that I shall have the support of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in an effort to restore the administration of the schools to the proper authorities. And now, while I am discussing the schools and this particular law enacted in 1906, which carried this provision for the appointment of a school board by the supreme court, I will say that we also enacted into law what was known as the longevity law in the principle of pay to the teachers of the District of Columbia.

I for one opposed that law at the time it was enacted. I confess that then I did not realize half the iniquity there was in it as I realize it now, and I do not believe that there has been a system placed upon the statute books that carries with it more of injustice, more of inequality, than is contained in the provisions of this act. I know that I am treading on thin ice when I make any reference to a change or any intimation that I would like to change existing conditions respecting the pay of teachers in the city of Washington, but under the present law there is absolutely no merit in promotion. It is automatic and merely means time. Teachers appointed, for instance, in a grade, when first appointed, may be appointed to a position of \$600. Later there may be 25 new teachers, as this bill carries 30. Each one of these teachers receives the next year under this law an increase of \$50 in their salaries, and the next year an additional \$50, and so on until they have reached \$800 in that particular class. The teacher who shows aptitude, industry, and capacity for promotion can not under this law be promoted any more rapidly than that teacher who merely does enough to keep from being discharged. There absolutely is no merit in promotion, and it is automatic. When they reach \$800 of that particular class they are, by recommendation of this school board, put into the next class, and they start at \$800 and their pay is increased \$100 a year until they reach \$1,200, and then again, when that is exhausted, they are put in the next class, and they advance \$100 a year until they reach \$1,800, absolutely without any examination or any regard paid to the efficiency of the teacher.

All you have to do under this system as a teacher of the District of Columbia is to do just well enough not to be turned out, and you are promoted just as rapidly as the most efficient and industrious teacher there is in the school. I say that a system that does that is not a good system at least and ought to be abolished. I believe that there are instances innumerable where teachers employed in the city schools of Washington at \$600 a year for the first year, showing aptitude, industry, and a capacity to teach, ought to be promoted possibly the very next year to the \$1,000 grade, whereas there are many, and I am afraid a majority of those who are employed at \$600 ought never to receive another cent of compensation because they are

not worth it. But this system automatically carries them all up, and it is a drain upon the Treasury, and it ought not to be allowed. Why, we carried the first year this was inaugurated an extra appropriation of \$43,000 to pay this excess of longevity pay. The estimate submitted to the committee and the Congress upon which this bill was prepared asked this Congress to appropriate \$485,000 to pay this excess of longevity pay. There is no man on earth who can state whether it is the proper amount or some other amount. The mathematician does not live who can figure out with accuracy at the end of the school year what they shall have to pay, and no man can tell me—I have not been able to find anyone, the superintendent, the chairman of the school board, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, all have never been able to give this committee any information as to when we are going to reach the maximum possible under this law. I believe if it were in the power of this committee handling this bill, without the provision being subject to the point of order, if we could legislate there would have been contained in this bill a provision to repeal the statute placed upon the books in 1906. I believe it ought to be repealed and a just system inaugurated into law that takes cognizance of merit of those who have charge of the children of the District of Columbia. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 25 minutes and has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, and the questions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] diverted me, we have made appropriations in this bill not only for the maintenance of all the establishments of the District of Columbia in an amount which in the judgment of the committee is sufficient to meet all necessities, but we have gone even beyond that in a great many instances, and while the bill does not provide for a number of new projects that have been suggested, yet it does meet all the necessities of the proper conduct of the affairs of the District of Columbia.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to a situation that exists. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PROUTY] touched upon this just a few minutes ago. The amount of money required from the District of Columbia under existing law to meet the District's share of the appropriations provided in this bill is \$5,566,764.22. The amount of taxes that are estimated for the fiscal year 1916 by the District Commissioners in round numbers to \$8,000,000. Here are more than \$2,000,000—say two and a half million dollars—for which no provision whatever is made. Gentlemen of the committee, we have discussed, certainly in the last appropriation bill, because of that section becoming somewhat famous as section 8 in which we undertook to change the ratio of payment as between the District and the General Government in the conduct of the affairs of the District, and I want to say now, under the facts as they are presented before us by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who make the estimate for the needs of the District of Columbia, that the amount available under the current law is vastly in excess of the possibility of wise expenditure. Under the present law if it is met this District appropriation bill would carry, and of necessity carry, \$16,000,000. I do not hesitate to make the statement, and I believe it would be agreed in by every Member of this House who has investigated in the slightest degree the necessities of the District of Columbia, that it is absolutely impossible to expend in this District without the rankest waste and extravagance \$16,000,000 in the conduct of its affairs in any one fiscal year.

You must admit one of two things—that we have either got too much money or that we must be spending too much money and spending it, too, unwisely and wastefully. This has been referred to as the organic act, but there is nothing more organic about it than any other statute that is written on the books by the Congress. It is sacred in the eyes of a certain element in the District of Columbia; but I say to you that unless you change that law—and this is the responsible body for the government of the District of Columbia, and the responsibility rests with us—unless you change the law that provides that the National Government must match every dollar that is raised in taxation in the District of Columbia and expended in this District, you must make up your mind that you are going to spend money with recklessness and waste. The system has broken itself down, and it has broken itself down in spite of what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PROUTY] said to you is true—that the amount of taxes levied and raised upon the property in this District is less both in assessment and in rate than in any other city in the United States of America; in the face of the fact that, so far as my observation goes, no other population in the United States enjoys as great privilege as do the private citizens of the District of Columbia. The time has come, in my judgment, when this Congress should change this law and place

it upon a basis of fairness and equity—fairness to the general taxpayers of the United States—and deal out nothing more than exact justice to the property owners of the District of Columbia.

If you investigate no further than to read the newspapers that are published in this city, you would suppose that no other population on earth was so burdened with taxes as the residents of the District of Columbia. The facts are all against them. As a matter of fact, I do not believe there is a Member of this House, living in any jurisdiction in the United States of America, if he owns property in that jurisdiction, that does not pay a higher rate of taxation upon it than any citizen of the District of Columbia pays upon his property. I live in a village in the State of North Carolina, a State whose taxes are possibly as low or lower than the average of the States in this Union. I live in a village of less than 1,000 people, and I pay more taxes, twice over, than are paid in the District of Columbia by any citizen in it, because I pay not only a tax upon the property that I own for the purposes of that village, but I am assessed, as are you, for the maintenance of your county and the maintenance of your State. And the tax rate in the State of North Carolina amounts to more than 2 per cent for a man who has a municipal tax to pay. I state there is not a gentleman here who has a less rate than 2 per cent, and usually on the full valuation. And yet in the District of Columbia, living here with all the advantages that have come because of the presence of the National Capital, with numbers of advantages that do not exist in most cities, at least—and I own a piece of property in the District of Columbia, and know what I am talking about—their property is assessed at about two-thirds of its value and at 15 mills, which amounts to what Judge PROUTY has said, that I am paying 10 mills, or \$1, whereas in my State, or in my home, I pay more than \$2. And so do you. And yet I am taxed at the rate of 20 mills to help conduct the affairs of the District of Columbia, whose citizenship pays 10 mills. And even at this extremely low rate of taxation, with only tangible property placed upon the tax books, they are raising now more money than can be wisely expended under the present law. And it is high time that there was inaugurated some other system by which we should levy taxes and administer the affairs of this District.

I am not one of those who would contend that there is no obligation upon the General Treasury, upon the National Government, for the maintenance of this District. On the other hand, I contend that we have an obligation that we should discharge. I do not believe that it can be measured by any per cent. I have never believed that any man could justify by the matter of percentages the obligations of the National Government to its Capital. It is a matter merely of the needs and not of percentages. I stand here and say unreservedly that when taxes, levied in the proper amount and at the proper rate upon the property of the citizens of the District of Columbia, are raised and exhausted, whatever amount it may be, it is the duty of this Congress and of the National Government to supplement that sum in whatever amount is necessary for the proper conduct of this District. I do not care whether it is 25 per cent or whether, in an emergency, it might be 75 per cent. It is not a matter to be measured by percentages, but, as I said awhile ago, by the necessities that exist for the expenditure of money. And I think it is a simple matter to arrange, and that it is high time that it was arranged.

I hope that the membership of this committee will lend us their aid in the quick passage of the bill under consideration. I want to say for myself, and I imagine I speak for every Member of this House, that we want to finish these appropriation bills, and, unless we do, our expectation of going home on the 4th day of March and staying there will be thwarted. There is but one way, and that is to diligently keep at work upon these bills. I hope that this committee may have the cooperation of every Member in the House in the dispatch of this bill. [Applause.]

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, namely:

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, by striking out the words "one half of," in line 3; and the words "out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia," in lines 4, 5, and 6; and the word "namely," in line 9, all on page 1, and insert the following as an amendment thereto: "That all

moneys appropriated for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the revenues of said District to the extent that they are available, and the balance shall be paid out of money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, and all laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserve a point of order on the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have some explanation of the amendment before withdrawing the reservation or insisting on the point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the explanation of it simply is this: Under the provisions of my amendment all of the money raised by the District of Columbia from taxation and privileges would be first expended; then, whatever balance was necessary after that, in order to meet the expenses of the District Government, will be paid out of the Federal Treasury, not to exceed one-half.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand that the gentleman's amendment cuts out the language "in full for the following expenses."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It was not so intended.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it did. It ought not to do that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk again report the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk report the paragraph as it would read if amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the paragraph as it would read if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the word "and" be inserted, so that it will read correctly.

The Clerk read as follows:

And that the following sums—

Mr. FITZGERALD. There should be no "and" there.

Mr. BORLAND. "And" follows the word "sixteen," in line 8. The Clerk read as follows:

That the following sums, respectively, are appropriated in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916: That all moneys appropriated for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the revenues of said District to the extent that they are available, and the balance shall be paid out of money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, and all laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether this is not, in substance, section 8, which was passed last year, with a limitation that the one-half provision that the National Government shall be paid is to be operative?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that this proposition is very different, indeed, from the proposition submitted a year ago in section 8. Section 8, if the gentleman will remember, provided that the surplus of District revenues should be converted into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. This proposes to expend entirely the receipts of the District revenue supplemented in whatever amount may be necessary in the proper conduct of the District, not to exceed an equal amount, from the National Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. The effect on the taxpayers of the District would be the same; instead of the surplus money being turned into miscellaneous receipts, they would go to the respective appropriations.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. They would get the benefit of all the taxes under this provision that they pay, whereas under the other provision a certain amount of the taxes might be turned into the Treasury. I think there is a considerable difference.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it is largely a question of book-keeping.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, evidently the amendment was not reported the way the gentleman desires it to read. I suppose the gentleman wants it to read: "The following sums, respectively, are appropriated."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The word "is" ought to be changed to "are."

Mr. FITZGERALD. The word "is" should be changed to "are," and I suggest to the gentleman that that be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "is" in the printed bill be changed to "are."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so changed. There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I renew the point of order. The gentleman from Kentucky has not yet stated that he has any authority from the committee to offer the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I do not concede that that is necessary; but, to be on the safe side, I want to say that the following resolution was adopted by the committee when this matter was under consideration by the committee.

At a meeting of the committee on the District of Columbia, held on the 9th day of December, 1914, H. R. 19547 having been called up for consideration the following resolution was adopted, to wit:

Be it resolved by the committee that H. R. 19547 be reported to the House with the expression of opinion that it should pass when amended by striking out the word "exceed," in line 9, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "be as much as"; and further, that said bill as amended by the committee, or the substance thereof when put into the form of an amendment, be offered as an amendment to H. R. 19422 while said bill No. 19422 is being considered in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union or in the House.

Mr. MANN. I concede that that authority of the committee would authorize the gentleman from Kentucky to offer that proposition to this bill under the Holman rule, if it was offered and is germane, but that is not the proposition that has been offered. That is entirely distinct from the proposition now presented.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There is no difference. The bill H. R. 19547, a copy of which I send to the Clerk's desk, and which I will insert in the Record, was before the committee for consideration. That House bill, in its exact form, could not be offered as an amendment, and therefore the committee adopted the resolution that that bill, or the substance of it, when put into a resolution which would fit the District appropriation bill, should be offered as an amendment. Under the Holman rule the report of a committee having jurisdiction of the matter, or of a commission to which has been referred the consideration of a matter to make a report to the House, upon that report the matter would become eligible as an amendment to the bill. Now, a commission could do nothing more than to make a suggestion; but the substance of this bill has been offered in this amendment, and the resolution covers that very situation.

The bill reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19547) to provide for the manner of paying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That all moneys appropriated for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the revenues of said District to the extent that they are available, and the balance shall be paid out of the money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses.

Sec. 2. That all laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky says that the amendment which he has offered is in substance the bill which the committee authorized him to report. If that be the case, the amendment is not in order. The paragraph under consideration just read simply makes an appropriation of the sum thereafter named, and provides the funds out of which they shall be paid. We ordinarily make an appropriation of so many dollars out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. That is a mere definition of the funds in the Treasury out of which the appropriation is to be paid.

I concede that under the authority granted by the committee the gentleman probably might offer an amendment changing the fund out of which this appropriation is to be paid, but that is not the amendment which has been offered. The only provision in this paragraph in relation to the appropriation made in this bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, while the gentleman's amendment seeks, under pretext of amending this provision, to amend the law for all time, or until it shall be changed hereafter. That amendment is not germane to this provision of the bill. The gentleman might offer an amendment, I think, under the action of his committee fixing the fund in accordance with the action of the committee out of which this appropriation for the fiscal year 1916 is to be paid, but it is not a germane amendment to seek to hang onto this provision a provision changing the law or repealing existing law. He has endeavored to go too far, Mr. Chairman. It is perfectly patent to the Chair and every one else that where you have a provision appropriating \$10,000 out of funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated that you could not hang onto that a

provision repealing law or changing law or adding new law which does not relate to it. It would not be germane. The only provision in this bill is in reference to the appropriations or the sums carried in this bill for the fiscal year named, and it is not in order as a matter of germaneness to seek to repeal law or change law relating to other years.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Chair to say just a few words upon this point of order. The proposer of the amendment, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], in his statement to the Chair said that he did not concede that this amendment would not be in order offered in his individual capacity, without any authority from the committee, and in what I shall say to the Chair I shall take the position that this amendment would be in order, offered by an individual Member from the floor, without any authority from the committee having jurisdiction of the legislative subject. What is the rule? Rule XXI provides that an amendment proposing legislation on an appropriation bill is in order under certain contingencies, and one of those contingencies is by the reduction of the amount of money appropriated in the bill. This amendment seeks to repeal the act of 1878, which commits the Government to contributing one-half of the amount expended for maintaining the government of the District of Columbia. What does this amendment seek to do? It seeks to repeal that, and as it is certainly germane the question follows, Does this amendment reduce the amount covered by the bill? If the Chair will notice this amendment, he will see that it repeals the act of 1878, and provides that in no event shall the amount appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States for the District government equal one-half of the amount appropriated for the District of Columbia. Therefore it is bound to reduce the amount that the Government of the United States contributes to the support and maintenance of the government of the District of Columbia. Clearly, it does reduce the amount covered by the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Georgia was, I think, absent on account of illness last year?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The Chair ruled on two or three occasions that an amendment substantially like this was a reduction or retrenchment of expenditures, although it did not even limit it to less than one-half. The argument was made by some of us that it was uncertain whether it was a retrenchment of expenditures. Two or three chairmen—two at least, I am sure—on substantially the same thing ruled, and I think that would be the settled construction in the House now, that it was, even if that limitation had not been placed upon it.

Mr. CRISP. As I understood and caught the reading of the amendment, it provided that in no case should the amount appropriated from the Treasury of the United States be as much as one-half.

Mr. MANN. I understand, and I suppose the gentleman did catch the amendment. I have no doubt that he prepared that part of it, but I say, irrespective of that, I think the Chair ruled twice last year, so far as that point is concerned, it would be in order.

Mr. CRISP. As the gentleman from Illinois states, I was not here last year on account of a very serious and protracted illness, and I am not familiar with the decisions referred to. But I do desire to call the attention of the Chair to an analogous case and a decision based upon this very proposition. This was a decision made in the Fifty-second Congress, based on this Holman rule, and the language of the rule, so far as this is concerned, is identical with what it is to-day. In that Congress the late Mr. De Armond, of Missouri, moved to recommit the District of Columbia appropriation bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report it back reducing the amount or proportion that the Government of the United States was to pay toward the maintenance of the government of the District of Columbia. The point of order was made that that amendment was legislation and not in order on an appropriation bill. The Chair held that it was, and, with the indulgence of the Chair, I will read the decision. I read from page 361 of the Manual, under Rule XXI, section 825:

Question being on the passage of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, a motion to recommit with instructions to reduce the proportion of the fund appropriated from the Public Treasury from one-half, as provided in the bill, to one-fourth of the entire appropriation is in order, since the effect of the amendment, if adopted, would reduce the expenditure of public money, although not reducing the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully contend that this amendment repeals the act of 1878, and it necessarily reduces the amount of money appropriated from the public funds of the Treasury

of the United States for the maintenance of the District of Columbia, because under the amendment the amount appropriated from the United States funds can in no case be as much as one-half of the total amount of the bill, as the present law requires. Therefore, in my opinion, the amendment offered by an individual Member from the floor without authority from the committee having legislative jurisdiction of the subject is clearly in order under the Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that there is but one question in this, and that is the question of germaneness. The Chair will resolve that in favor of the amendment and hold that it is in order. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from North Carolina expect to have a vote on this amendment to-night?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I would like very much if we could reach a vote on this amendment, if we can reach an agreement as to the time for discussion under the five-minute rule. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois desire?

Mr. MANN. I will not want much time, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, I think before 6 o'clock we can determine this matter and reach a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can determine it right now by the Chair putting the question.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. As far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, I do not desire any time, and I am ready to vote, but I do not know about gentlemen around me.

Mr. MANN. My observation is that gentlemen who do not desire any time to begin with usually want time before they get through.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will admit that something may be said that might provoke me to consume some time, but at present I have no intention of consuming the time of the committee.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OGLESBY. Is it not a fact that this amendment involves the repeal of the half-and-half proposition?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In my opinion it repeals it, but it only repeals it for the year for which this appropriation is made. There may be some difference of opinion about that, but it certainly repeals it as far as this appropriation goes.

Mr. OGLESBY. Does the gentleman think a discussion and settlement of that proposition can be had between now and 6 o'clock?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, I think it could. How much time would the gentleman like to have to discuss it? We are trying to find that out.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will realize that there is no quorum present, and if somebody should insist on a quorum—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, if some gentleman wants people here to hear him he can force me to desist now.

Mr. MANN. That is not the point. Undoubtedly one side or the other would want a quorum when it comes to a vote.

Mr. MONDELL. My suggestion was that a quorum would be insisted on.

Mr. MANN. Would it not be the wisest thing now to see if we can not agree upon a time for debate, and then let it go over until to-morrow, because you do not want to finish debate to-night.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Unless there is an indication of a desire for time, which has not manifested itself so far, I would make the proposition that debate could be concluded on this amendment in 30 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the chairman of the committee allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. Why would it not be better to proceed with the reading of the bill and let this matter go over until after the other paragraphs are concluded?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do not think we would be in any better condition then, I will say to the gentleman, because we would have to go through the same performance when possibly we might have less people here than now.

Mr. MANN. I suggest this to the gentleman: It is quite certain the gentleman would have to have a quorum in the House, and I expect he could get them to-night at the time of the vote. Now, I have discovered that it is not wise to finish a debate on a proposition at night and then start in and vote the first thing in the morning. Let us agree upon a time for debate to-night and then quit until to-morrow.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MANN. I was trying to find out from people how much time they wanted. As far as I am concerned I do not want much time. Who wants time?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in view—

Mr. MANN. I would be willing to make it 30 minutes on a side. That is a very reasonable debate.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I am willing to accept that on this amendment. I realize that it is a matter of some importance to some gentlemen in the House and of some importance to the District, and if 30 minutes be consumed to-night then I will make the motion that the committee rise.

Mr. MANN. But we do not want to go ahead now.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Then, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Let us fix the time if we are going to do so.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in one hour—one half of the time to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in one hour—one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Minnesota. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19422, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRUKKER, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. BALTZ, on account of the death of his brother.

HOURLY MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 11, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting twenty-eighth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission (H. Doc. No. 1389); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from Messrs. Daly, Hoyt & Mason, counselors at law, of New York, embodying a further report of the operation of the Maritime Canal Co. of Nicaragua (H. Doc. No. 1327); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting annual report of the Department of Justice, as required by law (H. Doc. No. 1390); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Big Annemessex River, Md., with a view to providing a suitable channel from Clear Creek Point to Muddy Creek Point (H. Doc. No. 1328); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, submitting a list of reports to be made to Congress by public officers during the Sixty-third Congress (H. Doc. No. 1329); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report on present condition and value of tract of land known as Mount Weather, Va., on which there was maintained the United States weather station (H. Doc. No. 1330); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of allotments from the appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the preservation and maintenance of existing rivers and harbors works for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1331); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement showing expenditure of money appropriated for the collection of military records of the Revolutionary War, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1332); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement showing the number of typewriting machines purchased by the War Department for the first three months of the fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 1333); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of disbursements for the fiscal year 1915 from the proceeds of the sale of public lands, for the support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts (H. Doc. No. 1334); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting 1,027 reports of inspections of disbursements and transfers by officers of the Army received in the office of the Inspector General during the past fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 1335); to the Committee on Military Affairs and letter only ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of communications of the Postmaster General submitting revised and decreased estimates of appropriations in connection with certain items for the Postal Service for the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1336); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of communications of the Postmaster General submitting revised and increased estimates of appropriations in connection with certain items for the Postal Service for the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1337); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINDQUIST: A bill (H. R. 19739) providing for the labeling, marking, and tagging of all fabrics, leather and rubber goods as hereinafter designated, and providing for the fumigation of same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 19740) to amend section 857 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19741) to provide for the purchase of ground and erection of a public building thereon for an immigration station in or adjacent to the city of Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 19742) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Easton, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 19743) granting certain lands to school district No. 56, Klickitat County, Wash., and authorizing the issuance of a patent therefor; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 19744) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912, by amending section four thereof so as to include soldiers in the Indian War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROCKSON: A bill (H. R. 19745) providing for a site and public building for post-office and other Federal purposes at Seaford, Del.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 19747) to increase the pension of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) authorizing the appointment of a committee to inquire into and report concerning the equity of the existing taxing system in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARDNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) authorizing the Secretary of War to increase the personnel of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 671) appropriating \$400 for folding speeches; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GARNER: Resolution (H. Res. 672) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives all facts in his possession with reference to the conduct of the collector of customs of the Laredo district, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19748) granting a pension to Maria Route; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19749) granting an increase of pension to Martha Deny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 19750) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 19751) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19752) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. De Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARR: A bill (H. R. 19753) granting a pension to David Forsythe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19754) granting an increase of pension to Eliza C. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19755) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 19756) granting an increase of pension to William L. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19757) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dashiell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19758) granting an increase of pension to William B. Sisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19759) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19760) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 19761) granting a pension to Myra Shine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 19762) granting an increase of pension to John Wilhelm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 19763) granting an increase of pension to Robert Mountjoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 19764) for the relief of T. E. Gage; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 19765) granting a pension to William G. Webber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19766) granting a pension to Frank B. Broadie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 19767) granting an increase of pension to William R. Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19768) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 19769) granting a pension to Sarah J. Ayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19770) granting a pension to Rose E. Wicoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19771) granting an increase of pension to John D. McDearmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19772) granting an increase of pension to William Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19773) granting a pension to Susan E. Euston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19774) granting a pension to William Lammerhirt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 19775) granting an increase of pension to William Pickerill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 19776) granting an increase of pension to Abner B. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19777) granting an increase of pension to William S. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 19778) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Devlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19779) granting an increase of pension to Anna R. Laing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19780) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 19781) for the relief of Anthony J. Coccaro; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 19782) granting a pension to James H. Johns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 19783) granting a pension to Jess Musgrave; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 19784) for the relief of the heirs of William August Ahrend, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19785) for the relief of the heirs of Tobias Clark, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19786) for the relief of the heirs of James Franklin Ford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 19787) granting an increase of pension to Emily Jane Hilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19788) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 19789) granting a pension to Nathan D. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 19790) granting a pension to Caroline M. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19791) granting an increase of pension to George Hartsgrove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19792) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Shemo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19793) granting an increase of pension to George H. Hendrickson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 19794) granting a pension to Daniel Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 19795) for the relief of Silas Overmire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19796) granting an increase of pension to Allen J. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19797) granting an increase of pension to John Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 19798) granting a pension to Elvira Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19799) granting a pension to Ellen Hutchins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19800) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19801) granting an increase of pension to Martha K. Hass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19802) granting an increase of pension to W. K. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19803) granting an increase of pension to James S. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 19804) granting a pension to Adelia Vosburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19805) granting an increase of pension to James H. Gallup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19806) granting an increase of pension to Emil B. Koenig or King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19807) granting an increase of pension to Peter S. McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 19808) granting an increase of pension to John C. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 19809) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19810) granting an increase of pension to Tapley T. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19811) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Jessop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 19812) granting an increase of pension to George W. Tilman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany H. R. 11029, for relief of William Cagney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petition of I. S. Miller and A. & I. Hoover, of Newry, Pa., and A. S. King, J. G. Gousman, and E. H. & B. Claar, of East Freedom, Pa., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of Painters' Local Union, No. 275, of Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to prohibit the exporting of all food products to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Local No. 143, International Union of Steam and Operating Engineers of Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of the Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of citizens of Uniontown, Rockwood, Point Marion, Connellsville, Berlin, Meyersdale, Garrett, Confluence, Urside, Fairchance, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of H. R. 5308, taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of Local No. 520, N. A. L. C., of Uniontown, Pa., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Milwaukee (Wis.) Typothetae, relative to abolishing free printing of stamped envelopes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Western Association of Short Line Railroads, protesting against the passage of H. R. 17042 or S. 6406; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FESS: Petitions of Esther Ganse and Rev. Joseph Shepherd, of Westboro, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, relative to retirement of aged employees of the Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of H. M. Buckley and 18 other citizens, of Newburyport, Mass., favoring bill barring certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of Frank Watson, N. B. Gardner, W. H. Lane, J. C. Brown, J. L. Batterman, J. F. Deering, G. W. Fraser, W. H. Randall, W. A. Taylor, I. W. Brayton, J. H. Stutz, Philip Shippee, R. F. Spencer, G. R. La Flash, Arthur Seymour, C. E. Wilbur, Jr., C. E. Wilbur, Sr., J. R. Cochran, E. C. Wilbur, Chester P. Winsor, and S. K. Goff, all of North Scituate, R. I.; Mrs. L. A. Lathrop, Mrs. Helen M. C. Kendrick, Miss Ellen M. Pabodie, Mrs. M. F. Humphrey, Miss M. E. Dray, Mrs. H. J. Roworth, Miss Cynthia Potter, Miss Mary Mackie, Mrs. L. H. Barton, and Mrs. F. A. Bliss, all of Providence, R. I., urging the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Carolina, R. I.; W. M. Burgess, W. E. Spencer, A. L. Sprague, W. A. Atwood, S. E. Hopkins, D. I. Cutler, E. P. Shippee, J. C. Worden, Jr., R. T. Franklin, H. M. Arnold, Benjamin Wood, Pierre Carrier, Lester H. Blanchard, Walter Phillips, Dewey Paul, G. H. Potter, Preston Potter, A. E. Borden, Fred Erleech, Mrs. F. J. Erleech, C. O. Geer, E. M. Spencer, D. S. Bishop, J. H. Hutchinson, B. W. Randall, George Gardner, K. A. Grover, V. T. Dimitroff, A. K. Brison, and W. E. Turpee, all of North Scituate, R. I., urging the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of certain citizens of Ohio, favoring a national referendum vote on restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of citizens of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of 275 citizens of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of Knights of Columbus of Astoria, Oreg., asking that charges of cruelty in Mexico made by Theodore Roosevelt be investigated by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDQUIST: Petition of sundry citizens of the eleventh congressional district of Michigan, favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Brinton and of Ottawa County, Mich., protesting against the Sunday-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of 40 citizens of Breckenridge, 75 citizens of Ithaca, 40 citizens of Morley, and other citizens, all of the State of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of residents of first congressional district of Missouri, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Western Association of Short Line Railroads, protesting against the passage of House bill 17042 or Senate bill 6406; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring Senate resolution for Government ownership of electrical means of communication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of H. F. Burns and others, of Copperhill, Tenn., in support of prohibition amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Young Friends' Association, held at Newton, Pa., protesting against any increase in armaments, fortifications, or armies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Branch No. 113, Catholic Knights of America, protesting against the ill treatment of Catholics and sisters in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Jens Musgrave; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of 110 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Navesink, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Silvia and 116 citizens of Nanvoo, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THACHER: Resolutions adopted by Second Baptist Church, Second Congregational Church, Marshfield Hills; Christian Endeavor, Marshfield; Advent Christian Church, Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, Plymouth, all in the State of Massachusetts, favorable to nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALLIN: Memorial of common council and sundry citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, December 11, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, all of Thy blessings wait upon Thy changeless and eternal law. Thou hast made known Thy will to us and all that Thou hast made. The earth about us and the heaven above us speak of the infinite purposes of God in man. We desire to make this land the transcript of the divine purpose. We pray for that grace and knowledge of Thy will whereby we may be workers together with God. Make this land after the pattern Thou hast revealed to us in Thy holy word. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

COE I. CRAWFORD, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, and JAMES K. VARDAMAN, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. LANE presented the credentials of GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN, chosen by the electors of the State of Oregon a Senator